Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-230
Thursday
2 December 1993

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-230 2 December 1993

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CSCE Foreign Ministers Session Ends in Rome 1
Estonia's Velliste Speaks *[ETA NEWS RELEASE]* 1
Ukraine's Zlenko Holds News Conference *[Kiev International]* 1
Russia Rejects 'Inadequate' Ukraine Document *[ITAR-TASS]* 1
Russian Contribution Hailed *[ITAR-TASS]* 2
Black Sea Assembly Session Concludes in Kiev 2
More on Plyusch, Kravchuk Speeches *[Kiev Radio]* 2
Kravchuk Meets Georgian Official *[ITAR-TASS]* 3
Moldovan Delegation Attends *[BASAPRESS]* 3
Plyushch, Lucinschi Confer *[INTERFAX]* 3
Lucinschi Supports Integration *[ITAR-TASS]* 4
Romanian Delegation Attends *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 4
Cindoruk Addresses Closing Session *[Ankara TV]* 4
News Conference Held on Results *[UNIAR]* 4
More on Results of Session *[ITAR-TASS]* 5

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Kozyrev Discusses European Security, NATO *[Prague RUDE PRAVO 29 Nov]* 6
Polish Foreign Minister Writes on NATO, Ties *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 7
Shokhin Says Internal Rifts Hurt Trade Talks *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 1 Dec]* 9
Meets U.S. Treasury Official *[INTERFAX]* 10
'Partnership, Cooperation' Talks With EC Open *[INTERFAX]* 10
Kuwaiti Defense Minister Continues Visit 10
To Purchase Military Hardware *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
Officer Skeptical on Trade Prospects *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 1 Dec]* 11
Minister Visits Test Site *[Russian TV]* 11
Tour of Air Force, Missile Bases *[ITAR-TASS]* 11
Envoy Returns to Yerevan; Mediation To Continue *[INTERFAX]* 12
Chernomyrdin, Belarus' Kebich Discuss Economic Issues *[ITAR-TASS]* 12
Border Issues Discussed With Georgia in Sochi *[ITAR-TASS]* 12
Military Apartments Misappropriated in Georgia *[Tbilisi Radio]* 12
Expert Views Dangers of Ukrainian Nuclear Weapons *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 5 Dec]* 13
UN Control Over Human Rights Urged in Latvia, Estonia *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
Diplomat Sees Further Strain in Estonia Ties *[INTERFAX]* 14
Japan Said To Support Russian Role in Space Station *[ITAR-TASS]* 14
Hosokawa Terms Yeltsin Visit 'Constructive' *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 30 Nov]* 15

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political Issues

Zorkin, Luchin Suspended From Constitutional Court *[ITAR-TASS]* 16
Further on Dismissal *[SEGODNYA 2 Dec]* 16
Zorkin Says Suspension 'Illegal' *[ITAR-TASS]* 16
Luchin Terms Sacking 'Revenge' *[INTERFAX]* 16
Decision on Parliamentary Chambers Reached *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 1 Dec]* 17
Russia's Choice Suggests Kremlin for New Parliament *[ITAR-TASS]* 17
New Parliament To Have Legislative Committees *[ITAR-TASS]* 17

Election Issues

Constitution Draft Must Be Available to 'Every Voter' *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Dec]* 18
Election Contenders Quoted on Constitution *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Dec]* 18
Kostikov Denies Yeltsin Against Criticism of Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 18
Sirotkin: New Constitution Can Protect Human Rights *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
Minister Says Constitution To Be Adopted *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
Zorkin on Election, Ban on Criticizing Yeltsin *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 1 Dec]* 19
Yavlinskiy Bloc Calls For Debate on Constitution 5 Dec *[Russian TV]* 21
Shumeyko Remarks on Constitution Criticism Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 21
Top Officials Express Optimism for New Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
Russia's Choice Figures Welcome Court Ruling *[ITAR-TASS]* 22
Russia's Choice Accused of Using Foreign Funds for Campaign *[ITAR-TASS]* 22
Civic Union Accuses Russia's Choice of U.S. Financing *[INTERFAX]* 22
Media Ban on Pre-Election Opinion Polls Explained *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
TV Chief Poptsov Defends Election Coverage *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 23
Commission Imposes Media Ban on Election Polls *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
Democratic Blocs May Campaign Together Against Revanchists *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
Election Buildup Viewed as Nominations Close *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 1 Dec]* 24
Parties' Stance on Army Issues Surveyed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Dec]* 25
Russia's Choice Distances Itself From Shumeyko *[SEGODNYA 2 Dec]* 27
Russia's Choice Blames Yeltsin Aides for Damaging Image *[SEGODNYA 2 Dec]* 27
Gaydar, Sobchak, Yavlinskiy on Election Show *[Russian TV]* 28
Shakhray, Others Air Electoral Platforms *[Moscow TV]* 30
Yavlinskiy Will Not Form Alliance With Communists *[INTERFAX]* 31
PRUA Leaders Outline Election Programs *[ITAR-TASS]* 31
Election Commission Refuses To Ban Parties *[ITAR-TASS]* 32
Poll Shows 'Russia's Choice' Leads *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 32
Commission Meeting Studies Issues for 12 Dec *[ITAR-TASS]* 33
Paper Denies Involvement in Telephone Poll on Election *[IZVESTIYA 30 Nov]* 33
Tribunal Resolves Election Registration Disputes *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Dec]* 33
Amendments to Lists of Registered Election Candidates *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Dec]* 34

Media Issues

Journalist Rails Against 'Excommunication' of Media *[Russian TV]* 34
Press Ministry Blamed for Letting DEN Reemerge *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 5 Dec]* 34
Trial Issue of 'First Russian Tabloid' Published *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Nov]* 35

Economic Issues

Yeltsin Issues Edict on Foreign Banks' Activities *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Dec]* 35
Edict on Credit, Debt Reschedules With Ex-USSR Nations *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Dec]* 36
Gaydar Answers Phone-In Questions on Economy *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Nov]* 36
Speculation on Possible Government Split Over Budget *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* 40
Soskovets Comments on Economic Conference *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 1 Dec]* 41

Regional Affairs

Shakhray: Russia Should Maintain CIS Military Presence *[INTERFAX]* 41
Shakhray Party To Back Chernomyrdin as Prime Minister *[INTERFAX]* 42
Yavlinskiy Not To Ally With 'Government' Parties *[ITAR-TASS]* 42
Merger of Moscow, Oblast Denied by Both Chiefs *[KURANTY 1 Dec]* 42
Nonparliamentary Opposition Movement Formed in Moscow
[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 1 Dec] 43
Moscow Air Defense District Performing Well *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Nov]* 43
Sobchak Speaks in Omsk on Party's Aims, Constitution *[INTERFAX]* 44
Sobchak Speaks in Kemerovo on Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 44
Tatar Chief Spurns Federation Council, Urges Talks *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 5 Dec]* 44
Tatar Parliament Urges Nonparticipation on 12 Dec *[INTERFAX]* 45
Tatarstan DPR Calls For U.S. Election Observers *[INTERFAX]* 45

Tatar Parliament Turns Down Draft Constitution *[SEGODNYA 2 Dec]* 46
More on Bomb Blast at Krasnodar Newspaper Office *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 46
Samara Voting Intentions Poll Results Published *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 46

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Yeltsin Reaction to START I Decision Cited *[KIEVSKIYE VEDOMOSTI 30 Nov]* 48
Russian Ambassador on Relations, Nuclear Arms *[URYADOVYY KURYER 30 Nov]* 49
Foreign Affairs Official Views Nuclear Issues *[UNIAR]* 50
French Reaction to START I Decision Noted *[ITAR-TASS]* 50

National Affairs

Decree Names National Security Council Members *[Kiev Radio]* 50
START Committee Member on Nuclear Intentions *[KYYIVSKA PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 50
Security Official on Military, Nuclear Doctrine *[KYYIVSKA PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 52
Cabinet Cancels Previous Currency Benefits *[URYADOVYY KURYER 30 Nov]* 53
Fleet Commander Views Progress in Shipbuilding *[MOLOD UKRAYINY 30 Nov]* 53
Fuel Market Problems Causing Power Cuts *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 1 Dec]* 54
Statistics Ministry Discloses Foreign Trade Data *[Kiev Radio]* 55

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

'Power Ministers' Criticize Army, Cadres Policy *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Dec]* 56
Supreme Soviet Official Reacts *[NARODNAYA GAZETA 26 Nov]* 56
'Belarus' Faction Calls For Presidential Power *[INTERFAX]* 56
Printing Branch Officials Issue Appeal *[RESPUBLIKA 30 Nov]* 57

Moldova

Snegur Discusses Transdniester, Ukraine's Role *[KIEVSKIYE VEDOMOSTI 20 Nov]* 57
Officials View First Round of Dniester Talks *[ITAR-TASS]* 58
Gagauz Republic Dissolves Local Councils *[INTERFAX]* 58

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

Almaty Clarifies Position on Karabakh Conflict *[Yerevan Radio]* 60
Baykonur To Be Leased to Russia or International Firm *[INTERFAX]* 60
Letter Circulated Protesting Zhirinovskiy Remarks *[IZVESTIYA]* 60
Deputies Urge Supreme Soviet, Local Elections *[ITAR-TASS]* 61

Kyrgyzstan

Akayev Decrees 30 Jan Referendum on President *[INTERFAX]* 61

Tajikistan

Authorities, Opposition To Hold 'Constructive' Talks *[ITAR-TASS]* 61
Badakhshan Leader Welcomes Aid, Rejects 'Islamic State' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Dec]* 62

Turkmenistan

Atayev Resigns Over Niyazov Lifetime Presidency Plan *[SEGODNYA 30 Nov]* 62

Uzbekistan

Ukrainian Ambassador Discusses Bilateral Issues *[INTERFAX]* 62

CAUCASUS

Armenia

Russian Envoy Kazimirov Returns to Yerevan *[SNARK]* 64
Tension Reportedly Increasing on Karabakh Borders *[Yerevan Radio]* 64

Azerbaijan

Georgian Prime Minister Arrives on Visit *[Baku TV]* 64
Official Urges Increased Russian Role in Peace Process *[INTERFAX]* 64
Official on Ways To Settle Karabakh Issue *[INTERFAX]* 65
Karabakh Welcomes Iran's Mediation Efforts *[INTERFAX]* 66
Ex-President Terms Removal From Power 'Unlawful' *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 1 Dec]* 66
Gasanov Links Pipeline Project to Karabakh Solution *[London TV]* 66
President Aliyev Appoints New Rayon Chiefs *[Baku TV]* 66

Georgia

Tbilisi, Abkhazia Sign Memorandum of Understanding *[ITAR-TASS]* 67
Seven Killed in Abkhaz Shelling of Villages *[ITAR-TASS]* 67
Tbilisi Assails Abkhaz 'Armed Intervention' *[Tbilisi Radio]* 67
Tbilisi, Abkhazia Exchange 'Intervention' Charges *[INTERFAX]* 68
Shevardnadze Holds Talks With Ajarian Leader *[Tbilisi Radio]* 68
Leaders Meet Russian Commanders *[ITAR-TASS]* 68
Shevardnadze Hails Russian Role *[ITAR-TASS]* 69
Black Sea Fleet Ships Withdraw From Poti *[ITAR-TASS]* 69
Military Procurator Analyzes Defeat in Abkhazia *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 19 Nov]* 69
Parliament Imposes State of Emergency, Balks at Dissolution
[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 30 Nov] 71
Chikvaidze Views Ties With South Africa, CIS *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 19 Nov]* 72

BALTIC STATES

Latvia

Russia Accepts 3-Day Delay in Withdrawal Talks *[BNS]* 74
Defense Minister Meets Czech Counterpart in Prague *[ITAR-TASS]* 74
Andrejevs Concludes Trade Pact in Australia *[BNS]* 74

Lithuania

Parliament Approves Nuclear Convention, Other Accords *[BNS]* 74
Defense Minister Sees Security Guarantees in Union *[RESPUBLIKA 18 Nov]* 74
Security Adviser Dismissed Over High Crime Rate *[BNS]* 75
Official Comments on Foreign Debt, Investments *[TIESA 11 Nov]* 75

CSCE Foreign Ministers Session Ends in Rome

Estonia's Velliste Speaks

WS0212084393 Tallinn ETA NEWS RELEASE in English 2223 GMT 30 Nov 93

[Text] Tallinn, November 30—Estonia's Foreign Minister Trivimi Velliste presented a speech at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on Tuesday [30 November] pointing out that Russia is still attempting to tie troop pullout to several supplementary conditions.

Velliste also said that a common practice for Russia was to disband its military when still stationed in Estonia implying that they would thus get a chance to stay.

Velliste also expressed Estonia's views over Russia's strive to get special warrants as a peacekeeper on the territory of CIS while criticizing Moscow's "near abroad" conception in foreign policy and "unilateral and destabilising military operations" which Russia repeatedly undertakes at its border regions. Velliste warned that granting Russia international mandate for activities that have nothing in common with peacekeeping would legalise new division in Europe, the so-called new Yalta agreement.

Velliste also met his Turkish counterpart Hikmet Cetin and French Foreign Minister Alain Juppe.

During Velliste's foreign visits on November 30 - December 4, Defence Minister Juri Luik is the acting Foreign Minister.

Ukraine's Zlenko Holds News Conference

LD0112223193 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1700 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Ukraine Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko, who is taking part in the work of the CSCE session in Rome, held a news conference today.

He noted that unfounded accusations have been heard on the part of certain participants at the lofty forum to the effect that Ukraine has supposedly declared itself a nuclear state. However, the minister of foreign affairs emphasized, Ukraine does not want and has never desired to acquire operational control over nuclear weapons. The nuclear button is located in Moscow, and one should not forget this. For Ukraine nuclear weapons are material wealth, in which the labor of the Ukrainian people has been invested. There is, therefore, every ground for demanding just compensation, Anatoliy Zlenko stated.

The minister explained Ukraine's stance regarding the nuclear weapons located on its territory. The decision of the Supreme Council on ratification of the START I Treaty, he said, opens the way to gradual elimination of nuclear arsenals. The world should realize this, understand it, and take a step to meeting Ukraine halfway.

The head of the foreign policy department stressed that giving Ukraine appropriate guarantees of security and economic assistance on the part of the world community would remove all obstacles from Ukraine's path to acceding to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Touching on the issue of giving Russia a mandate for peacemaking operations on the territory of the former USSR, the minister of foreign affairs emphasized that a reliable mechanism to control such operations needs to be created, which should only involve multinational forces. The television and radio agency Novyny reported this at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine.

Russia Rejects 'Inadequate' Ukraine Document

LD0112180393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1718 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksey Bukalov, Georgiy Shmelyev]

[Text] Rome December 1 TASS—The European Community had faced an unprecedented challenge. For the first time since the nuclear non-proliferation treaty was signed in 1968, the process of nuclear non-proliferation is being actually reversed. This fact was highlighted by Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev at a session of the Council of CSCE Foreign Ministers which ended in Rome today.

Ukraine, being a CSCE member-state, in contravention of its commitments has recently announced that it possesses nuclear weapons, which created an entirely different situation on the European continent.

Ukraine has confirmed its stand during the session of the Council of Foreign Ministers, as a result of which a principally important statute on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons was not included in the final resolution.

The Ukrainian delegation made various conditions and reservations throughout the discussion, including in working groups and at a session of the Committee of Senior Officials, which has practically blocked a resolution on this very important problem.

The Russian side, which considers the spread of nuclear weapons to be the worst threat to the European security, declared it necessary that the principle of the inviolability of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty be reflected in final documents.

Resolutions in the framework of the Council of Foreign Ministers are adopted on the basis of consensus. The Russian delegation decided against giving its consent to adopting a document on this problem since it believes that the document is inadequate to the present-day situation and does not fully takes into account the threat of nuclear proliferation.

Russian Contribution Hailed

LD0212115893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1028 GMT 2 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Aleksey Bukalov, Sergey Startsev, Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Rome December 2 TASS—The action programme for 1994 has been discussed by heads of foreign policy agencies of participating countries in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). A meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of CSCE countries was held here on November 30 - December 1. The Rome forum has adopted streamlined balanced documents on specific and most pressing problems encountered by Europe. There is a common view that the Russian delegation has made a large contribution to the work of the CSCE forum. The initiatives advanced by Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev at the meeting largely determined the course of the debate and formed the basis of the final communique of the forum and the document "decisions".

Russia's proposal to adopt a special declaration condemning aggressive nationalism in all its manifestations evoked particular interest. For several years, Russia has been calling the attention of world public to the menace of aggressive nationalism that replaced the danger of totalitarianism. Russian diplomats believe that this is the most serious challenge to security and stability in eastern Europe and in Western Europe. This is why Moscow has demanded more decisive [as received] over tough measures regarding this problem and insisted that this attitude be registered in documents of CSCE.

Another important problem raised by the Russian delegation at the Rome forum is specific and effective support for Russia's peacemaking efforts, including material support. Russia is dealing virtually alone with the problem of the settlement of conflicts in the territory of the CIS and bears the burden of expenditures involved in this. Moscow pointed to the need of joint actions in this direction and noted that the work of CSCE observers should not consist of mere contemplation of events.

The debate on nuclear nonproliferation was most acute. Andrey Kozyrev in his speech at the forum said: "For the first time since the signing of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in 1968, the nonproliferation regime is not consolidated in Europe and more states do not accede to it. The reverse is actually taking place". One of the countries of CSCE, Ukraine, contrary to officially assumed obligations announced its possession of nuclear arms. During the forum the Ukrainian delegation at various levels proposed a number of amendments and "specifications" which considerably eroded the draft decisions on this important problem. In this situation the Russian delegation did not deem it possible to agree to adopting the document in this wording and said that Kiev bears the responsibility for this. The Russian delegation also suggested that the document be referred to experts. Wishing to ensure that the partners do not dismiss this idea, the delegation linked this proposal to the discussion of the entire package of military matters in Vienna. The coordinated document should be referred to the committee of high officials of CSCE in March 1994.

The Rome forum has not reached a consensus on the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. The positions of the Armenian and Azeri sides were, unfortunately, absolutely incompatible.

In accordance with Russia's proposals to transform structures of CSCE, the Rome forum has decided to transform the Vienna group into the permanent committee of CSCE in Vienna at ambassadorial level.

The decisions taken in Rome are called upon to enhance the role and effectiveness of CSCE and promote the strengthening of security and stability in Europe.

Black Sea Assembly Session Concludes in Kiev

More on Plyusch, Kravchuk Speeches

WS3011142893 Kiev Ukrayinske Radio First Program Network in Ukrainian 1100 GMT 30 Nov 93

[Report by Yuriy Gorban]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The session of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Parliamentary Assembly opened at 1000 with a speech by Husamettin Cindoruk, assembly president and chairman of Turkey's Grand National Assembly. He thanked the participating countries for the great attention paid to the session, and praised Supreme Council Chairman Ivan Plyushch and the Ukrainian Government for the outstanding arrangements, warm welcome, and hospitality provided to the conference participants. According to Husamettin Cindoruk, the region is currently undergoing a period of transition. Political and economic systems of the countries are being changed and there are very important ecological problems. In the six months of its existence, the assembly has proved capable of acting efficiently and has begun to operate in almost all economic fields. In his opinion, the organization should also assume responsibility for stabilizing the situation in the region. The transition process should not drag on, however; all countries must contribute to this. The organization is a competent forum at which countries can learn about one another; it is an opportunity to reach mutual understanding, Assembly President Husamettin Cindoruk concluded in his speech.

Supreme Council Chairman Ivan Plyushch addressed the session on the part of the Ukrainian Supreme Council. He emphasized that Ukraine, from the very beginning, supported the idea of establishing such an assembly, because the fields of cooperation defined by the assembly's declaration are very important to our country. The Supreme Council speaker then outlined the economic situation in our country. In his opinion, the situation is complex due to changes in production relations and shortages of energy sources. In Ivan Plyushch's opinion, this is the main reason reforms are not proceeding as quickly as they could. He also emphasized that acceleration of the reform process is connected with

the activities of the assembly. The Ukrainian Supreme Council chairman also pointed to the ecological problems of the region, in particular the Chernobyl breakdown. For Ukraine, Chernobyl expenses represent almost 15 percent of the budget, and Ukraine is not able to solve this problem, given the current economic situation. Ivan Plyushch called upon the members of the assembly to pay attention to this tragedy. We are waiting for any kind of help, humanitarian and technical, said the Supreme Council chairman. In Ivan Plyushch's opinion, experts from the participating countries have established foundations for the Black Sea Bank of Development and Trade, which is to become the financial basis of the cooperation. We should make all possible efforts to unite the Black Sea nations, and ensure that the seashores remain peaceful and open for all kinds of beneficial cooperation, concluded Ivan Plyushch.

President Leonid Kravchuk also addressed the assembly. The following are the main points of his speech:

Ukraine's foreign policy is based on widely recognized norms of international law and the UN statute. Ukraine upholds a principle of international security, and is consistent in its willingness to become a nonnuclear country. However, it expects to receive guarantees for its national security, as well as financial and other help in dismantling nuclear weapons. In the Ukrainian president's opinion, our state should play an important role in ensuring political and economic stability in Europe. Ukraine considers its neighbors to be priority partners. Leonid Kravchuk also voiced a few proposals to convert the Black Sea region into a zone of stability and peace. To achieve this, in his opinion, it is necessary to set terms for joint naval exercises, to reduce the number of navy vessels, adopt a declaration on the inviolability of sea borders, introduce a memorandum on using naval forces against neighboring countries, and sign a declaration on nonaggression among the Black Sea countries. Cooperation among the Black Sea countries is the best guarantee for peace in the region, concluded Leonid Kravchuk.

Kravchuk Meets Georgian Official

LD0112151793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1128 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Aleksandr Litvinov]

[Text] Kiev, 1 Dec—President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine today received Vakhtang Goguadze, head of the Georgian delegation attending the autumn session of the parliamentary assembly of the Black Sea Economic Community and speaker of the Georgian parliament. Leonid Kravchuk pointed out Ukraine's interest in the further development of bilateral relations with Georgia, with whom it is linked by deep historical roots. Ukraine, the president emphasized, will continue to render the necessary assistance to Georgia and to expand mutually beneficial cooperation.

Moldovan Delegation Attends

AU0212103493 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 2030 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Kiev, BASAPRESS 1/12/1993—The second session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea countries was finished today in Kiev. It started on 29 November 1993 with the speech of the chairman Husamettin Cindoruk. On the same day, credential letters of member countries were examined. The agenda of the session and the protocol of the first session from June 1993 in Istanbul were approved as well. The report of the Bureau of the Parliamentary Assembly on its activity between the two sessions, together with that of the Commission for Economy, Trade, Technology, and Ecology have been presented. The improvement of customs taxes and the stage of economic cooperation between the member states were discussed. Participants also considered the regulation of the Parliamentary Assembly and the synchronization of member states' laws. The Moldovan delegation consisting of Dumitru Brasoveanu, deputy chairman of the Parliamentary Commission for Protection of Family, Mother and Child, Mihai Ghimpu, deputy chairman of the Legal Commission, Fiodor Angheli, member of the Commission for External Ties, and Petru Griciuc, member of the Commission for Ecology. Petru Lucinschi, parliamentary speaker, led the delegation.

Plyushch, Lucinschi Confer

LD3011220593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1913 GMT 30 Nov 93

[Text] Petru Lucinschi, head of the Moldovan parliament, asked his Ukrainian counterpart Ivan Plyushch to help in resolving the Transdniestrian problem, customs disputes and arguments over the foreign property of the two countries. The two men met within the framework of the Parliamentary Assembly of Black Sea Economic Cooperation conference which was held in Kiev Tuesday.

According to Lucinschi, these issues will be discussed when Moldovan President Mircea Snegur visits Kiev. He expressed the hope that before the visit takes place bilateral Ukrainian-Moldovan documents on the above issues would be signed.

Lucinschi said that he was disappointed with discussing these issues with Russian officials who, in his words, signed documents but did not follow up on them.

He and Plyushch agreed that the statement about Russia protecting the rights of the Russian speaking population elsewhere in the CIS was "a kind of incitement for more resolute action on the part of Russian speakers."

Plyushch also said that if there had been no 14th Russian Army in Transdniestria there would not have been one half of these problems.

"Everybody understands everything. We should call a spade a spade and so cut this knot," the Ukrainian speaker said.

Lucinschi Supports Integration

LD3011214393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1945 GMT 30 Nov 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Olga Tanasiychuk for TASS]

[Text] Kiev November 30 TASS—"The idea of integrating countries with different levels of economic development and different confessions is most promising", Moldovan Parliament Chairman Petru Lucinschi, leading the republic's delegation to the autumn session of the Parliamentary Assembly for Cooperation of the Black Sea States, said here Tuesday.

He also stressed that Moldova has been taking an active part in the work of the association from its very point of emergence.

"Without removing us from the traditional market, this gives another momentum to our developing and strengthening relations with other countries", he said.

The session which is being held in Kiev, is also attended by the Albanian and Romanian delegations. Representatives of the participating delegations have met with Chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Council Ivan Plyushch.

Romanian Delegation Attends

AU0112142793 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1235 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES 1/1/1993—A Romanian parliamentary delegation headed by UDMR [Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania] deputy Karoly Kerekes is currently attending the Parliamentary Assembly for Economic Cooperation in the Black Sea area in Kiev, reads a ROMPRES broadcast.

The members of the Romanian delegation advanced proposals for all the issues on debate, especially as regards the ways and means to grow economic exchanges in the Black Sea area.

On the occasion, the Romanian parliamentary delegation as received by Ivan Stepanovich Plyushch, president of the Supreme Council of Ukraine, during which approached were issues regarding the process of transition towards a democratic society and market economy.

The members of the Romanian delegation were also received by Husamettin Cindoruk, president of the Parliamentary Assembly for Economic Cooperation in the Black Sea area and president of the Grand National Assembly of the Republic of Turkey.

Both sides expressed satisfaction over the fine ties between Romania and Turkey and their wish to further their collaboration bilaterally as well as multilaterally.

Cindoruk Addresses Closing Session

TA0112200193 Ankara TRT Television Network in Turkish 1800 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] The fall general council meeting of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Parliamentary Assembly [BSECAS] has ended in Kiev. Ali Oruc from the Turkish Radio and Television team in Kiev reports the following:

[Begin Oruc recording] Cultural and financial issues were discussed at the closing session. A decision was also reached to hold the spring meeting of the BSECAS in Bucharest. Husamettin Cindoruk, speaker of the Turkish Grand National Assembly and chairman of the BSECAS, addressing the closing session, said that regional security is necessary in order to achieve peace and that great duties befall the Assembly on the issue. Stressing that it is important for the Assembly to fulfill its duties, Cindoruk added: As a confidence- building measure among the members countries, it is important that work be carried out to draw up a document stressing the inviolability of borders. Such an approach will enable a solution to existing or future conflicts among the member countries through political consultations and not clashes, a method which is unacceptable in our era. Cindoruk noted that the view that conflicts among the member countries should be solved through peaceful means is prevalent. He added: An early peace is the best kind of peace.

Cindoruk later held a joint news conference with Ivan Plyushch, chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Council. At the news conference, Cindoruk said that significant cultural, political, and environmental documents have come out of the Assembly meetings and that these documents will soon yield political results. Noting that great duties befall the Assembly in preventing regional clashes, Cindoruk added: If we can achieve this then there is no need for either the United Nations or the CSCE. These organizations can then turn their attention to global matters instead of regional ones. [end recording]

News Conference Held on Results

LD0112230093 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 1515 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Kiev, 1 Dec—A news conference on the outcome of the autumn session of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Parliamentary Assembly has taken place in the hall of the Supreme Council of Ukraine. Replying to a question by a correspondent from DER SPIEGEL magazine (Germany), Ivan Plyushch, chairman of the Supreme Council of Ukraine, reported that Leonid Kravchuk sees his task as explaining to the world community the content of the reservations made by the Ukrainian parliament when ratifying the START I Treaty. However, Ivan Plyushch noted that Leonid Kravchuk "as president of Ukraine and as a human being can either accept or not accept the content of the reservations," and has the full right to turn to the parliament of Ukraine for explanations. The chairman of the Supreme Council called the statement of the Russian Government concerning Ukraine's stance on

START "brutal in form and distorted in content." He noted that the reservations of the Supreme Council of Ukraine to START ratification do not touch Russia's interests and do not violate a single norm of the treaty.

In connection with reports that China and Turkey "have an understanding attitude" toward Ukraine's stance and reservations over START, a question was addressed to the chairman of the Supreme Council: Who specifically supports Ukraine's stance or at least has an understanding attitude to it? Ivan Plyushch did not reply to the question, while Mr. Cindoruk, president of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Parliamentary Assembly and chairman of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, proposed that journalists get the answer to this question at the next assembly of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Parliamentary Assembly, which will take place next spring.

People's Deputy Anatoliy Kasyanenko, the newly appointed ambassador of Ukraine to Georgia, believes that Mr. Cindoruk avoided answering the question from an UNIAR correspondent because he had received instructions from Washington to change his stance (it is well known that Turkey is the only NATO country to support Ukraine's position during ratification of the START treaty).

More on Results of Session

LD0112175893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1621 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Olga Tanasiychuk for TASS]

[Text] Kiev December 1 TASS—The Black Sea Economic Cooperation Parliamentary Assembly completed its formation and became a full-fledged international organization, its President Husamettin Cindoruk said at the close of the assembly's autumn session on Wednesday [1 December]. Projects developed by the assembly are designed to impart an impetus to further development of close contacts among the region's countries.

The president noted that the parliamentary assembly would work to find a solution to such global problems as fighting AIDS and other diseases, as well as preserving the Black Sea. Much attention was also paid to the liquidation of the aftermaths of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster. Proposals were moved to apply to the Governments of Ukraine, Russia, Turkey, and Bulgaria with a request to speed up the construction of a lyceum in the Black Sea city of Sevastopol for children affected by the disaster. Participants in the session favoured the idea of setting up a Black Sea university in Romania under the auspices of the parliamentary assembly. They also stressed the need to further develop ties among higher educational institutions of the assembly member-countries, to open private schools and lyceums. Speakers at the session emphasised that peace, accord and stability in the region could be achieved only through cultural and spiritual socializing.

The session endorsed the budget for 1994 and elected Dimitru Brashovyanu of Moldova the assembly's treasurer.

The next session of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Parliamentary Assembly is scheduled to take place in Bucharest in June, 1994.

Kozyrev Discusses European Security, NATO

AU0112190193 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 29 Nov 93 pp 1, 12

["Exclusive interview" with Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev by Jiri Roskot; place and date not given: "An Expansion of NATO Without the Participation of Moscow Could Evoke in Russia the Feeling of a Besieged Fortress"]

[Text] [Roskot] Has Moscow established direct contacts with the leading representatives of the Central European states to explain to them its arguments against NATO expansion?

[Kozyrev] Let us first clarify the matter in question. The stand of Russia with respect to the transformation of NATO focuses on three aspects:

—We do not perceive NATO as a threat to our security,

—We believe that the Central European states themselves have the right to determine how and in what way they want to build their own security,

—The expansion of NATO without the participation of Russia does not suit us even if it is not aimed against us. One of the reasons is that isolationism evokes the feeling of a besieged fortress. Although it is only a part of what may destroy the fragile Russian democracy, it can lead to the emergence of a new antagonism toward the surrounding world. Therefore, in recent months Russia has vigorously discussed this issue with the leading officials of both NATO member and nonmember states, including the partners in Central Europe. The Americans responded with the "Partnership for Peace" concept. It is gradually becoming obvious that a simple numerical expansion of NATO cannot react to new threats to European security connected, above all, with ethnic conflicts, aggressive nationalism, and uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear arms. We recommend as the first step to transform the North Atlantic Cooperation Council into a tool of the "Partnership for Peace," into an independent body that would under the auspices of the CSCE coordinate the peace efforts of NATO, the West European Union, and the CIS, and the cooperation in the military planning and the conversion in the NATO, Central European, and CIS states.

[Roskot] When explaining their pro-Atlantic orientation, the Central European countries argue, among other things, the shared civilization standards, culture, system of values, etc. What do you see as the key point for the common security in Europe?

[Kozyrev] In my opinion, the main thing is to prevent a new division of the continent according to economic, military, political, or ethnic borders, and not allow the emergence of regions with unequal security. I believe that one of the dependable guarantees of security of the states, including Central and Eastern Europe, could be joint endeavors for peace.

Regarding the argument of the shared system of values and culture, I believe that Russia is one of the most important factors of European civilization. The decision in favor of the partnership and ultimately an alliance between the states on both sides of the Atlantic is apparent to the democratic Russia. For centuries, Russia has been entering particularly into coalitions with countries that the ideological mythology of the second half of the 20th century identified as the Western ones.

[Roskot] Instead of the expansion of NATO, Russia spoke in favor of reinforcing the all-European security system. Judging by the endeavors of the Central European states to join NATO, the CSCE is experiencing a crisis of trust. Could you tell us about your idea of the CSCE potential? What is the place of Russia, NATO, and Central European countries within the CSCE?

[Kozyrev] Let me disagree with the idea that the CSCE is experiencing a crisis of trust. What you refer to is more like growing pains or maturing. The situation in Europe is changing so quickly that the CSCE, the only all-European structure to date, is unable conform to it fast enough. Nevertheless, I believe that precisely the basic principles and values of the CSCE could become the ideology of a new European arrangement. "Attracting" the new sovereign states to the general democratic standards would contribute to the establishment of the long-sought stability on the continent.

Similarly to other European structures, the CSCE seeks a new image. Russia is helping here to the best of its ability. This is the basis for our initiatives that we want to introduce at the upcoming session in Rome of the CSCE council of foreign ministers.

The CSCE must concentrate on the protection of the individual against aggressive nationalism. We propose that a document be adopted on the necessity of facing aggressive nationalism, a special CSCE conference be organized on migration problems, a convention on assistance to refugees be drafted, the responsibility of the states be emphasized for guaranteeing ordinary operation of the peace and arbitration missions, and a charter of rights of ethnic minorities be drafted.

The key for revitalizing the CSCE is organization, efficiency, and operativeness. This is the basis for the proposal to transform the Vienna group of the Senior Commissioners Council into a council of permanent representatives and establish in Prague the institution of the office of the CSCE secretary general.

The time is ripe also for drafting the optimum model of relations between various Euro-Atlantic security mechanisms. The privilege of main political decisions in this sphere should go to the CSCE. The diverse operative tasks may be executed by the existing regional organizations—EC, NATO, the North Atlantic Cooperation

Council, the West European Union, CIS, and subregional mechanisms in Eastern and Central Europe.

[Roskot] What are the strategic interests of Russia in the Central European area? Could you give us some details of your idea of Central Europe as a bridge between the West and the East?

[Kozyrev] Already because of its location, Central and Eastern Europe has always acted as the bond between the East and the West. This region has attracted most diverse forces and, at the same time, it has served as the arena for their clashes. Both world wars began here. The tumultuous political, social, and economic changes of the recent years again brought Central and Eastern Europe to the forefront of international politics, but apparently for the first time as an unattached player.

This is precisely Russia's point of departure in the formation of its new foreign political strategy regarding Central Europe, a strategy that is free of any nostalgia for its former role as the "big brother." Our specific long-term interests objectively coincide. Both the democratic forces in Russia and its Central European neighbors have to deal with complex social and economic problems, and have to face common threats in the form of aggressive nationalism.

Russia would like everything that once blemished its relations with the states of this region to disappear so that these states no longer feel any danger from their eastern neighbor. Nevertheless, it is important for Russia that the region so near be a sphere of good neighborly relations, stability, and cooperation.

Common interests must be applied in practice—in the strategy of partnership between Russia and the states of Central and Eastern Europe, which assumes a close cooperation in the matters of European and world significance while respecting mutual interests, and joint peace efforts.

[Roskot] In 1992, while the ratification of the Czech-German treaty was prepared, then U.S. President Bush and British Prime Minister Major replied to a letter from a group of Czech members of parliament to the representatives of the powers victorious in World War II, which took part in the Potsdam Conference. The MP's were interested in the stand of these officials regarding the postwar expulsion of Germans from Czechoslovakia. The Russian president did not reply. What is Russia's stand regarding the postwar expulsion?

[Kozyrev] The problems concerning Czechoslovakia and other countries victimized by fascism have been settled within the framework of the postwar arrangement in Europe, which found its expression in the Potsdam Conference documents.

The principles leading to the Potsdam decision have been further developed in the Helsinki Final Act, other CSCE documents, and finally also in the agreement on definitive settlement with Germany dated 12 September 1990. Of course, the Potsdam documents bear the sign of the specific historical conditions of World War II and the postwar period. It could not be otherwise. Of course, the most reasonable thing to do today is to build on the existing situation rather than to revive events almost 50 years old. That would only harm the trust between European states and the stability on our continent.

Polish Foreign Minister Writes on NATO, Ties

PM0212105193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 9

[Article by Polish Foreign Minister Andrzej Olechowski: "What Poland Wants"]

[Text] My Russian counterpart, Minister Andrey Kozyrev, noted in connection with the 75th anniversary of the restoration of Polish independence that Poland and Russia have a historic opportunity to build truly friendly relations without diktat, without paternalism, without ideological cliches and hypocritical embraces. That is true. It is in this spirit that I would like to frankly set out the Polish viewpoint.

I think that this is essential, because Russia's ambiguous position regarding our own and other Central European countries' endeavors to become members of NATO, not to mention manifestations by Russia that it perceives itself as encircled in terms of spheres of influence, cause serious concern in Poland.

I will not turn to the past; we must focus our ideas and efforts on the present and the future. So I will make just a brief, historical digression, one that is closely connected to the question of how we should conduct dialogue. Since we must not turn our backs on history as it was, good and bad, noble in the friendship between Mickiewicz and Pushkin, but unworthy and based on a great-power mentality in the lines written by that same Pushkin when he supported the extermination of the "haughty Pole" in "To Russia's Slanderers." (Footnote 1) (The lines to which the author of the article is referring are as follows:

Who will survive the unequal contest:
The haughty Pole or the loyal Russian?
Will Slav tears flow in the Russian sea?
Will the sea run dry? That is the question.)

This means only one thing: We expect Russian democrats to do everything to avoid scratching the wounds that are healing with such difficulty, to ensure that the word "Russia" does not sound sinister to the Poles.

I take an optimistic view of the future. We are keeping an eye on the major changes in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus in the belief that their aim is democracy and prosperity. We see that, like other peoples, the Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians know that building an empire is very costly, that it is done at the people's expense and results in the impoverishment of the citizen, and that therefore they are not allowing politicians to revive the aims and slogans of an outdated past.

We are alarmed by the present. We are experiencing today all the difficulties, hopes, and dangers of a transition period. It is a difficult road from communist leveling and tyranny to a market economy and civil liberties. The threat of the emergence of authoritarianism, xenophobia, and aggressive nationalism—that "higher stage of communism"—is a real one.

We will not be able to feel totally secure until the transformation process is completed in our region, until all countries have stabilized their democracy and their economy. A sense of security is in Poland's interests and also in the interests of European democracy and stability. A. Kozyrev rightly says that the existence of a sovereign, democratic Poland is per se a factor for stabilization and peace on our continent.

So we see security primarily as protection against the dangers of the transition period. At the same time we see it as broadening stability in our region and restricting opportunities for action by madmen contemplating diktat, expansion, and ethnic conflict. There is no other way of ensuring this security than for Poland to rapidly join not only Maastricht's European Union [EU] but also the existing NATO and West European Union [WEU] security structures. This decision is also dictated by Poland's historical traditions and place in the civilization. The obviousness of this path was specially reaffirmed in the joint declaration by Presidents Yeltsin and Walesa.

We do not see NATO and the WEU as aggressive military blocs. On the contrary, they are establishments created to defend the values to which Poland, Russia, Ukraine, and other countries in our region adhere. They are too slow in moving to greet the new era, but, like the Russian democrats, we know that they are not survivals of the past. Much less is the Washington Charter, proclaiming defense of democracy, individual freedom, and a rule-of-law state, a survival of the past. Hence democratic Russia, Poland, Ukraine, and Hungary, based on the very essence of the definition, cannot perceive these establishments as a threat to their national interests. "NATO and the WEU are our enemies" is the slogan of enemies of democracy.

Therefore, like Minister A. Kozyrev's statement in February 1993, we "see the NATO countries as our natural friends and, in the future, as our allies." What we want is for the North Atlantic alliance, without losing its nature as an establishment guarding the values of present-day civilization—democracy and individual prosperity—to become the pillar of the European security system. We consider our membership of NATO a step in this direction. We consider it to be the first step, since the security of Poland and Europe will not be lasting if the security system does not include Russia and other Eastern neighbors. The closer our ties with NATO, the more effectively we will act to promote that development.

There are many arguments to indicate that this concept of Poland's security contributes to the security of democratic Russia, brings Russia closer to Europe, opens up new political and economic opportunities for it, and does not, as some people claim, isolate it. I will point out just three of them.

First, Poland with its lasting ties with NATO, the WEU, and the EU will be a country open to the world, to its neighbors, without constant alarm over sovereignty and national pride. Only a country that feels secure and has support in the shape of well-tried organizations can be a reliable political and economic partner. Lack of confidence is not only the enemy of security but also the enemy of the businessman, the investor, and the banker. Poles who feel secure will see a Russian entrepreneur for what he is and not as the representative of a new empire. A secure Poland will work in the international community to further its neighbors' prosperity and development.

Poles are keenly aware of this: According to a recent public opinion poll, 52 percent think that we should maintain broad economic contacts with Russia, but only 24 percent see Russia as a friendly state, while 81 percent consider that Poland should become a member of NATO.

Second, a Poland in NATO and the WEU, calm about its sovereignty and broadening the sphere of stability in our region, can help Russian democrats to isolate Russia's Red-Brown nationalists and make it difficult for them to revive the empire.

Russia's democrats are entitled to expect support from us in their efforts to establish a democratic order in Russia. We want to afford them this help where possible. But this aid cannot take the form of surrendering in the face of the imperial forces and predisposing them to make more demands. What, after call, could be the consequences of compromise with the nationalists? What will Russia's objectives with regard to its neighbors, Europe, and the world be if proimperial forces are involved in defining those objectives? Our help for Russia's democrats may take the form of an open and sincere expression of our opinions, aspirations, and plans. However, it cannot consist in facilitating tactical compromises, the irreversible consequences of which can only be negative. That stance from Poland can only cause opposition from those who wish the Russian people ill and want to keep them impoverished, making up for this with the feeling of being an imperial superpower and holding sway over others.

There is a place in Europe and the world for a democratic Russia that respects other countries, a place worthy of its vast potential. But a Russia that turns to its inglorious past will only elicit unfriendly feelings and fears. We expect Russian democrats to put into effect, without deviation or dubious interpretation, everything that they have said hitherto on the question of sovereignty for Poland and the other countries in the region and on renouncing the diplomacy of diktat and of buffer, "gray," and other zones in the interests not only of Poland but also of Russia itself.

Third, clarifying questions of security will activate the dormant potential in our economic contacts. It is not in the interests of the future to keep trade exchange at the present level and in the present forms. Economic relations between neighbors with so much potential should not be reminiscent of a trading post in the Wild West. New incentives are needed, particularly since the Polish economy is already overcoming a profound crisis. We must expand trade, join forces via joint capital investments, and act together in third countries. All these initiatives, being undertaken today cautiously and with misgivings, will acquire scope and dynamism in an atmosphere of mutual benevolence and trust.

That is what we want. Today that is the most important aim of cooperation between modern, democratic countries.

Shokhin Says Internal Rifts Hurt Trade Talks

MK0112120093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 3

[Natalya Kalashnikova, Georgiy Bovt report in the "Aleksandr Shokhin's Press Conference" column: "Shokhin Calls for Greater Interaction Within the Government"]

[Excerpts] At yesterday's briefing Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin spoke not only about his visit to the United Arab Emirates [UAE] but also about the domestic affairs which have nonetheless evoked an international response. In particular, according to Shokhin, the so far unconfirmed rumor about a redistribution of functions within the Council of Ministers is indirectly affecting talks with the EC and the London Club. Moreover, the imposition of excise duties by the Finance Ministry places Russia in a difficult situation at the GATT talks.

According to Shokhin, in the UAE draft agreements on investment protection and the elimination of double taxation were nearly coordinated. The vice premier also drew journalists' attention to the Arab countries intention to develop the so-called offset programs—in other words, such programs whereby a substantial percentage of Russia's trade income is invested in a partner's national economy. These programs exist in military contracts and will now be extended to civilian contracts. In this connection Mr. Shokhin highlighted the need to search for opportunities for Russian investments. For their part, the Gulf countries' financial resources could be used for investments in Russia. So far, according to Shokhin, trade with the UAE is not balanced: Russian imports constitute $200 million, and exports approximately $800 million. [passage omitted]

Commenting on the edict banning foreign banks from operations with Russian residents, Mr. Shokhin said that this will affect talks with the EC. He has already received a letter from EC Deputy Chairman Leon Britten, who expressed concern over the fact that the edict contradicts the EC's mandate confirmed at the November meeting between Yeltsin and EC head Jacques Delors. Now, in order to coordinate the edict and the compromise reached with the EC, according to Shokhin, the following formula will have to be used: an offshore regime for EC foreign banks will operate until the moment the EC partnership agreement comes into force, and then those exceptions from the national legislation on which Russia and the EC have reached agreement will be applied. (At a meeting at KOMMERSANT-DAILY's editorial office on Friday, Finance Minister Fedorov described this compromise as "only tentative" while Yeltsin's edict, in the finance minister's opinion, does not affect the talks with the EC). [passage omitted]

[Article contains following boxed passages]

Commentary by the Economic Politics Department

In fact, Aleksandr Shokhin's news conference was devoted not to the prospects of relations with the UAE but to principles that the cabinet should follow in its work, amid a clash of interests among various departments and the ambitions of the vice premiers against the backdrop of growing interpartisan contradictions. Mr. Shokhin chose Boris Fedorov as his main opponent. The essence of the conflict goes deeper than a story of how Aleksandr Nikolayevich quarreled with Boris Grigoryevich. What is at issue is the role that the cabinet should play (while the actual redistribution of functions—which is denied by Shokhin—has already occurred between him and Federov who, in particular, has taken over from Shokhin as chief negotiator at the talks with the London Club): a lobby group promoting the interests of a particular department or a supra-departmental establishment. Shokhin's logic is as follows: If control of all of Russia's credit and financial relations with the West falls into Fedorov's hands, the interests of the Finance Ministry may outweigh Russia's interests. According to Shokhin, precedents already exist. Thus the presidential edict banning the activity of foreign banks in Russia appeared not without the participation of the Finance Ministry. As a result, Russia's accords with the EC have been put in jeopardy. A proposed way out is to preserve the former interdepartmental commissions in the government headed by the vice premiers, who are not encumbered by specific departmental interests.

The vulnerability of this position consists in that it proceeds from the existence of pure, "nondepartmental" vice premiers. There are none in the economic bloc of the Russian cabinet. Even Shokhin himself is chairman of the Russian Agency for International Cooperation and Development, which plays the role of a ministry of foreign investments. As a result, the separation of functions in the cabinet, just like its formation, becomes a political matter. A decisive role is to be played not by personal ambitions but by the influence of political parties, confirmed by the voters' ballot.

Commentary by the International Department

In spite of the declining volume of military export, Russia remains one of the largest arms suppliers. In 1992 revenues from their export constituted $2.3 billion, while government experts estimate the real volume of the Russian arms market in the next few years at $9

billion. In this context Russia's return to the lost markets, in particular, to the Persian Gulf countries—not as a politically ideologized but as an exclusively commercial partner—may be assessed as a reasonable move, especially given the high competition on the part of the West. It is appropriate to point to an emerging trend to conduct preventive [as published] trade and economic talks with countries against which UN sanctions are applied, for instance Libya and South Africa. According to some statements by the Russian leadership, relations will be normalized with Iraq, whose debt to Russia may be settled by oil exports which are now blocked by sanctions, and corresponding trade agreements with Baghdad need to be prepared even now.

Russia, however, will be able to implement effectively all these, as well as other foreign political and foreign economic moves, only provided that there is agreement within the Russian Government itself. At the same time, rumors about the redistribution of functions between the two vice premiers, heated up by the election struggles, testify rather to the opposite. Apparently a way out of the situation could be found in creating a coalition government wherein sharpened personal interrelations between its particular members will give way to civilized interaction subordinated to the norms of party discipline.

Meets U.S. Treasury Official

LD0112231393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2029 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Russian Vice Prime Minister Aleksandr Shokhin today held negotiations with the U.S. Vice Secretary of the Treasury, Lawrence Summers, to discuss the schedule of Russia's joint activities with international finance institutions.

Shokhin told INTERFAX that the talks focused on the second part of the U.S. systematic transformation credit worth $1.5 Bn. He said the American side expressed its confidence that the issue of granting the second part of the credit might be decided on in January.

Shokhin pointed out that Russia was concerned about its agreement on granting it a reserve credit from the International Monetary Fund, and it intended to speed up the negotiations on this issue. The vice prime minister said the immediate signing of the agreement with the IMF will directly influence the issue of delayed payment on Russia's external debts. "Without this agreement, it will be difficult for us to launch negotiations with the Paris Club (which is made up of the official creditors of the former Soviet Union - INTERFAX note) on restructuring the payments on our debts. Without an agreement with the Paris Club, we will not survive," Shokhin said.

He pointed out that the agreement to grant Russia the reserve credit will depend on Russia's success in the implementation of its financial and economic stabilization program. At the same time, not all IMF recommendations might be immediately put into practice as "we cannot ignore the social base of economic reforms. We must pursue an economic policy which takes into account the actual times and the real environment," he said.

'Partnership, Cooperation' Talks With EC Open

LD0112145593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1131 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] The 8th round of negotiations between the delegations of Russia and European Community started its work on Wednesday [1 December] in Moscow. It is to develop the text of the agreement on partnership and cooperation.

Georgiy Gabuniya, head of the Russian delegation and deputy foreign economic relations minister, told INTERFAX that the negotiations are to consider disputable problems which have not been resolved yet. In particular, he mentioned the issue on nuclear fuel trade and the issue related to Boris Yeltsin's decree on regulation of foreign banks' activity on Russia's territory.

According to Gabuniya, this decree aroused sharp reaction on the part of the European Community as it restricts possibilities for European banks' activity in Russia.

As far as trade with nuclear fuel is concerned, until now the European Community drew to the opinion that the products of nuclear fuel cycle should stay aside from the general trade regime.

As Garbuniya pointed out, it opens possibility for various restrictions in the trade. Russia does not see any grounds to consider this issue in this aspect. However, as he said, the Russian party is not inclined to dramatize the situation and hopes to reach compromises and mutual understanding in the course of the negotiations.

Kuwaiti Defense Minister Continues Visit

To Purchase Military Hardware

LD0112182193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1735 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Pavel Kuznetsov]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—"Russia has all necessary military machinery and could take part in the establishment of Kuwait's defence complex," Russian Vice-Prime Minister Oleg Soskovets said on Wednesday [1 December], following the Kuwaiti delegation's decision to buy Russian military hardware.

The statement was made during his meeting with Kuwaiti Defence Minister 'Ali al-Sabah al-Salim al-Sabah who is on a visit in Moscow.

The decision to purchase Russian military machinery was made after the Kuwaiti minister had toured an air force base outside Moscow known for its MI-8 and MI-26 helicopters which are of particular interest for

Kuwait and a military range in Kazakhstan which displayed Russian latest models of modern weaponry, including anti-aircraft and missile launchers, C-300b, Torm-1 and others.

The minister has also held talks with Russian Defence Minister Pavel Grachev and signed a defence agreement on cooperation between the two countries.

Russian First Deputy Defence Minister Andrey Kokoshin who took part in the talks said the agreement would help promote stability in the Persian Gulf area and would not be aimed against other countries.

The Kuwaiti minister said Iraq continued to hold Kuwaitis prisoner and refused to cooperate with the Red Cross committee seeking their release. The minister expressed the hope that Russia would support his country's position when this issue is to be discussed in the U.N. Security Council.

Soskovets said the Russian side would study the question and would its approach on "justice and friendship." He said Kuwait is "our real partner in the military and technical cooperation" and assured the Kuwaiti guest it will do everything possible to further it.

Officer Skeptical on Trade Prospects

MK0112131093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 3

[Viktor Zamyatin, Ilya Bulavinov commentary: "Moscow and Kuwait Sign Defense Alliance"]

[Text] Russian-Kuwaiti military cooperation became a reality after the 29 November signing of an agreement by Pavel Grachev and his Kuwaiti counterpart 'Ali Sabah al-Salim. The 10-year agreement calls for regular consultations between the military agencies, the holding of joint exercises in the Persian Gulf, and arms trading, which may in the future signify the restoration of Russia's former influence in the Middle East. KOMMERSANT-DAILY correspondents Viktor Zamyatin and Ilya Bulavinov comment on the course of the talks.

The agreement had been in preparation since 1992. Now Russia has become the fourth permanent UN Security Council member that has concluded a defense alliance with Kuwait. The document calls for Russia's aid to Kuwait in the "elimination of the threat to sovereignty, security, and territorial integrity and repelling an aggression." Russia undertakes to equip the Kuwaiti Army with modern types of weapons as well as to ensure their servicing (something that has up to now been a weak link in Russian military exports) and to train Kuwaiti servicemen. Joint naval exercises will take place at the end of the year.

As for purchases of weapons, the Kuwaiti market is indeed a morsel for which all leading arms exporters are contending. In 1992, the amir of Kuwait sanctioned the setting aside of $11.7 billion for arms purchases (over 10 years). Kuwait has already shown interest in buying BMP-3 infantry fighting vehicles and S-300 antiaircraft missile systems (Shaykh al-Sabah yesterday flew to Kazakhstan especially in order to see them in action at the Emba test range). Kuwait will probably not decline to buy Russian aviation technology also—the attention of its representatives has already been caught by MiG-29 and MiG-31 fighters, Su-27 bombers, and transport helicopters. Showcased for the first time at the air show in Dubai were also the latest Su-35's, which are also offered for export (despite the recent rule not to sell the latest armaments).

A high-ranking representative of the Russian General Staff was skeptical about prospects for selling arms in the Persian Gulf. He thinks that the Kuwaitis, despite the declared interest in Russian equipment, would still try "to get away with minor things" while preserving their strategic commitment to the United States, Great Britain, and France. The United States has already stated its readiness to sell to Kuwait 256 heavy M-1A2 tanks and other equipment worth up to $4.5 billion. Great Britain is going to sign a number of contracts with the emirate worth $4 to $5 billion in the coming three years. Nor is France passing up a chance: Along with the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait has become one of the main customers for the Leclerc tanks and Mirage planes.

Kuwait is apparently looking for support to ensure security outside the Persian Gulf, no longer relying on "Arab solidarity" and remembering the sad experience of the Iraqi invasion. The Arabs too think that a Russian presence in the region is necessary to maintain stability. In its turn, financial support from Arab shaykhs will not be a bad thing for Russia either. In fact, before the breakup of the USSR, Kuwait was its biggest creditor in the region. The Kuwaiti defense minister's talks will continue today. KOMMERSANT- DAILY will report its results in its 3 December issue.

Minister Visits Test Site

LD3011201093 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Nov 93

[Text] Kuwaiti Defense Minister Shaykh 'Ali al-Sabah, who is in Russia on an official visit, spent today in the town of Emba in Aktyubinsk oblast of Kazakhstan where one of the most important military testing grounds is located, at which the operation of the latest military equipment is developed.

His program also includes a visit to the air base of Kubinka and the continuation of talks on military-technical cooperation between Russia and Kuwait.

Tour of Air Force, Missile Bases

LD0112154393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1457 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—Kuwaiti Defence Minister 'Ali al-Sabah al-Salim al-Sabah who is on a visit in Russia toured an air force base outside Moscow on

Wednesday. He was shown Mi-8 and Mi-26 helicopters which are of particular interest for Kuwait.

Earlier he visited a military range in Kazakhstan to see Russian latest models of modern weaponry, including anti-aircraft and missile launchers, C-300B, TORM-1 and others.

The minister has held talks with Russian Defence Minister Pavel Grachev and signed a defence agreement on cooperation between the two countries.

The Kuwaiti guest is also expected to meet with the Russian military to discuss prospects for military and technical cooperation between the two countries.

The visit will last till December 3.

Envoy Returns to Yerevan; Mediation To Continue

LD0112145393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1131 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Sources in the Russian Foreign Ministry have told INTERFAX that the Russian Ambassador in Armenia Vladimir Stupishin, whose departure from Moscow was postponed because Armenians fired at the vehicle accompanying the car of the Russian president's special envoy Vladimir Kazimirov November 20, has returned to Yerevan.

Talking with INTERFAX Wednesday [1 December], Kazimirov said that Russia wanted to continue its mediatory mission to help settle the Karabakh conflict. He said that he maintained contacts by phone with the conflicting sides.

Kazimirov also said that both sides would also meet in Moscow with his mediation. The diplomat considered it early to make official statements about those contacts.

Another high-ranking Russian diplomat told INTERFAX that the incident with the car accompanying Kazimirov was not yet settled. Moscow decided not to link mediation with the "painful incident," since the latter must not paralyze Russia's peace-keeping efforts.

Chernomyrdin, Belarus' Kebich Discuss Economic Issues

LD0112195193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1746 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Dec—A meeting took place today between Viktor Chernomyrdin and Vyacheslav Kebich, head of the government of the Republic of Belarus, in the Valday, where the Russian Federation prime minister is on a short holiday. The further development of trade and economic relations between the two countries was discussed, in particular issues of converting debts and also of the mutual participation by the partners in privatizing enterprises in Russia and Belarus.

The sides noted with satisfaction that Belarus has completely paid off its debt for petroleum products supplied by the Russian Federation. Particular attention was paid to the inclusion of Belarus in the ruble zone. Complete mutual understanding was found here, as in other issues.

Taking part in the talks which lasted more than four hours were Oleg Davydov, Russian minister of foreign economic relations, and Nikolay Kostikov, vice premier of Belarus, as well as experts. This was reported to the ITAR-TASS correspondent by Valentin Sergeyev, head of the government's press service.

Border Issues Discussed With Georgia in Sochi

LD0112162793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1540 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Irina Shegoleva]

[Text] Sochi December 1 TASS—Commander of Russian border guard troops Andrey Nikolayev arrived in Sochi on Wednesday [1 December]. On the same day he met the head of the city administration, Nikolay Karpov.

During a meeting with journalists, Nikolayev said that the purpose of his visit is to resolve a number of problems connected with the construction of housing and technical facilities on the Russo-Georgian border. At issue is creating conditions for the normal operation of border guard posts, providing them with technical facilities and resolving their housing and social problems.

According to Nikolayev, a problem of the establishment of a border guard detachment in Sochi is being discussed now.

Speaking about the importance of reinforcing the state border Nikolayev stressed that all conditions would be created to maintain business contacts and enable relatives living in the two neighbouring countries to see each other.

A visa-free passage across the border through the Psou border guard post will remain. Other border posts will be established, if necessary, where border check formalities will be simplified, Nikolayev said. In his opinion, under the present conditions of close economic contacts and kinship ties introducing tighter border check formalities is impossible.

Military Apartments Misappropriated in Georgia

LD0112155493 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1400 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Russia brings to the attention of the Georgian leadership incidents violating signed treaties and agreements and strongly demands that activities directed against Russian servicemen are stopped. This was announced at a briefing yesterday by Grigoriy Karasin, director of the Russian Foreign Ministry's press and information department, in connection with the continuing misappropriation in Georgia of apartments belonging to servicemen of the Russian troops in the Transcaucasus.

The official said that an incident involving Colonel Ponomarev's apartment was another example of this. It happened at a time when Ponomarev was on a humanitarian mission assisting and evacuating refugees in Svaneti. His apartment has been turned into a barracks by Georgian soldiers who guard [former Defense Minister] Tengiz Kitovani's dacha. All attempts by Col Ponomarev to regain possession of his apartment by legal means resulted in physical threats against him, said Grigoriy Karasin. He said that this incident was far from being the only of its kind. Only recently about 150 apartments were misappropriated. In carrying out such actions, firearms are frequently used [words indistinct].

This information was supplied by ITAR-TASS.

Expert Views Dangers of Ukrainian Nuclear Weapons

MK0112142093 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 49, 5 Dec 93 (Signed to Press 30 Nov) p A4

[Interview with Major General Vitaliy Yakovlev, deputy chief of staff of the Defense Ministry's Main Directorate, by MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI military commentator Aleksandr Zhilin, in the "Expert Appraisal" column; place and date not given: "The Winged Chernobyls"]

[Text] More than 600 aircraft-based cruise missiles are located on Ukraine's territory. And although at present they have no flight missions, specialists believe that combat use of such missiles is quite possible. For this to happen it is enough for strategic bombers to deliver them to an enemy's territory and carry out emergency dropping. There will be no "classic" nuclear explosion but the radioactive pollution of the territory will be almost the same as with one. The probability of such a dangerous course of events is discussed by Major General Vitaliy Yakovlev, deputy chief of staff of the Russian Defense Ministry's Main Directorate, in a talk with MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI's correspondent.

[Zhilin] There has been much controversy over the Ukrainian nuclear charges. What can you say about this as a specialist?

[Yakovlev] Nothing reassuring. Today there are approximately 2,000 nuclear charges in Ukraine. Their technical condition can no longer be called satisfactory. Their warrantee service life is not more than six years, and some it is already running out. This calls for constant attention by maintenance and service personnel. In particular it is necessary to replace the obsolete components with new ones, which Ukraine does not have.

[Zhilin] But the Ukrainian nuclear warheads are serviced by Russian specialists.

[Yakovlev] Were serviced. After the Ukrainian parliament legitimized its ownership of the nuclear weapons and its defense minister issued orders to place the so-called S-type installations under his control, the Russian Defense Ministry lost the possibility to monitor the condition of the nuclear ammunition. There are no more Russian military units there. In other words, Russia can no longer be responsible for nuclear security on Ukraine's territory, while the latter for its part is incapable of ensuring nuclear security in handling these charges.

[Zhilin] What specific dangers does this involve?

[Yakovlev] Even the chief designers will not answer this question accurately. Nuclear charges whose service life has expired may not be safe to dismantle. Neither scientific research nor practical tests have been conducted on this count. No one could even expect such circumstances to arise.

In the current year designers and our specialists have visited a nuclear ammunition depot in Pervomaysk. The warheads there have begun to "run a high temperature." The reason is violation of the storage conditions. In particular there were eight times as many warheads in the storage as is allowed by the rules. The chief designers in their report insisted that all them be urgently sent for destruction. But the Ukrainian side did not agree. It should be noted here that the rules for storing nuclear weapons are being breached not only in Pervomaysk.

[Zhilin] If the expired service life makes the dismantling of nuclear warheads so dangerous, why then should Russia do it?

[Yakovlev] This is exactly what we have been talking about with our Ukrainian colleagues. If all the agreements on destroying the Ukrainian nuclear weapons concluded in Massandra are thwarted and the guaranteed service life expires, it is not ruled out that Russian enterprises may refuse to process the warheads.

[Zhilin] Does Russia supply components to replace the old ones on Ukrainian nuclear warheads?

[Yakovlev] Russia will supply them if Ukraine strictly adheres to the Massandra agreements.

[Zhilin] Can Ukraine use the nuclear forces for military purposes?

[Yakovlev] Last May part of the strategic bombers and also nuclear technical units operating approximately 600 air-based strategic nuclear charges swore the Ukrainian oath of allegiance. This means that Ukraine became potentially capable of using air nuclear weapons. True, to this end it has to resolve a number of technical problems. But as radiological weapons these charges can be used already now.

[Zhilin] What is the way out then?

[Yakovlev] There is only one: observance of the Massandra agreements. The Russian Federation Ministry of Atomic Energy is ready to dismantle all the nuclear charges stationed in Ukraine within 24 months.

[Zhilin] Can a situation arise wherein the nuclear warhead will "go" from Ukraine's territory to other countries?

[Yakovlev] I would like to stress once again that Russia does not control the condition and maintenance of these charges. In other words, should this happen, we may not even know about it. These are dangerous games fraught with a terrible disaster. I am saying this not as a politician but as a specialist on nuclear weapons.

UN Control Over Human Rights Urged in Latvia, Estonia

LD0112224393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2126 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Boris Sitnikov]

[Text] United Nations December 2 TASS—Russia has called on the United Nations to keep the human rights situation in Estonia and Latvia under control. This was declared by Yuliy Vorontsov, Russia's permanent representative in the United Nations, as he addressed the third committee of the U.N. General Assembly on Wednesday [1 December].

Vorontsov said that the General Assembly should look into the problem of whether there had been any changes for the better in the position of the Russian-speaking population after a resolution on human rights in Latvia and Estonia was unanimously adopted by the General Assembly a year ago.

Vorontsov pointed out that regrettably, no cardinal changes for the better had occurred. He said that since the beginning of 1993, the Estonian authorities have adopted a number of administrative and legislative acts in contravention to recommendations made by international experts, which have worsened the position of a considerable part of the population.

Vorontsov pointed out that the situation in Latvia was causing concern as well. A law on citizenship has not been adopted yet and as a result, local officials continue abuse. According to Vorontsov, Latvia is preparing to take practical measures to deport some of the Russian-speaking population. The Latvian Department for Citizenship and Immigration has prepared around a thousand instructions on deportation demanding to leave Latvia in seven days time without the right to return, the Russian diplomat said.

He pointed out that all reports provided by non-biased international experts indicate that problems affecting many hundred thousand people (over a third of the Estonian population and 40 per cent of the Latvian population), who have been ascribed to a category of non-residents, have existed and regrettably, continue to exist.

Vorontsov pointed out that "we cannot resolve problems connected with the citizenship on a bilateral level for a simple reason: Neither Latvia, nor Estonia agree to do so in practical terms... Under these conditions Russia has no way out other than to appeal to the authority of the international community represented by the world organisation—the United Nations—in order to protect the rights of hundred thousand people in Latvia and Estonia. Taking the human rights situation out of control of the U.N. General Assembly would be tantamount to the U.N. departure from the solution of problems it recognised a year ago and which still remain unresolved."

Diplomat Sees Further Strain in Estonia Ties

LD0112195893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1733 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Dmitry Vosboinikov, Igor Porshnev, Vitaliy Trubetskoy, and others; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature]

[Text] Russia favors a long-term moratorium on the territorial dispute with Estonia, and suggests efforts to improve the existing borders instead, a senior Russian diplomat responsible for relations with the Baltic region told INTERFAX.

In his view, the government in Tallinn has cornered itself by inserting into its Constitution a reference to the 1920 Tartu Peace Treaty between Russia and Estonia under which parts of the Pskov and Leningrad regions belong to Estonia.

The Estonians can no longer renounce territorial claims to Russia because these are enshrined in the country's Constitution, while Russia proceeding from international law considers the Tartu Peace Treaty as null and void following Estonia's incorporation in the former Soviet Union in 1940, he said. As a result, the two countries are unable to sign an agreement on supplies to their border regions, whith negative consequences for local residents, the diplomat said.

In his words, Russia has repeatedly offered Estonia to strike a compromise in order to narrow the existing differences. There has been no reaction from Tallinn yet, however, the diplomat said.

He thinks the situation is being strained further following the not so diplomatic statements and behavior by some Estonian emissaries who often visit the Pskov Region offering local residents to fill in applications for Estonian citizenship.

Japan Said To Support Russian Role in Space Station

LD0212123993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0657 GMT 2 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Varlamov]

[Text] Tokyo, 2 December—The committee on space research in the Japanese prime minister's office has decided to support Russian involvement in the project to establish the "Freedom" international space station. The United States, the EC, and Canada are the other participants in this project. ITAR-TASS learned today from informed sources at the Japanese Science and Technology

Agency that Tokyo will express this position at the intergovernmental consultations on the Freedom project, which are to be held in Washington on 6 December.

From the outset Japan has been suspicious of the Russo-U.S. agreement on Moscow's participation in the space station project, which was reached in September during the visit to the United States by Viktor Chernomyrdin, the head of the Russian Government. Tokyo felt that its own role in the program might be restricted as a result.

However, after Moscow and Washington fleshed out their plans in November, the Japanese side evidently came to the conclusion that forthcoming cooperation on the Freedom project posed no threat to its own space interests. These, at the moment, are confined to a wish to dock a "Japanese module" to the future orbiting station, on which it would carry out research into superpure substances.

Hosokawa Terms Yeltsin Visit 'Constructive'

PM0112161693 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 30 Nov 93 p 1

[Unattributed report from the "Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow" roundup: "High Evaluation of the Visit"]

[Text] Japan's Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa has given a high evaluation of the results of Russian President Boris Yeltsin's visit to Tokyo in October this year. Noting that it was a constructive contribution to the development of bilateral relations, the head of the Japanese Government made a statement on this during a meeting at his official residence with former British Premier Margaret Thatcher, who has arrived to participate in a series of international discussions.

In response to Hosokawa's request for an evaluation of the situation in the Russian Federation, Thatcher stressed that Russia is in a transitional period right now. It is vital to be acutely aware, she said, that it is difficult for Boris Yeltsin's administration to implement reforms leading to democracy and a market economy "in one fell swoop."

Political Issues

Zorkin, Luchin Suspended From Constitutional Court

LD0112201793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1835 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Igor Belskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Dec—The powers of Constitutional Court [CC] judges Valeriy Zorkin and Viktor Luchin have been suspended. This was announced at a news conference on the results of a meeting of court members, which has now ended, by acting CC Chairman Nikolay Vitruk. He said that the decision was taken on the basis of the current law "On the Russian Federation Constitutional Court," according to which members of the court are forbidden to engage in political activities.

According to a statement by the CC's acting chairman, which was read out at the news conference, the court regrets that lawyer Valeriy Zorkin became involved in a campaign of wholesale rejection of "the draft new constitution as a whole." The main reason for criticism from some members of the court against the former CC chairman—Judge Ernest Ametistov, who also attended the news conference, pointed out—is, specifically, Valeriy Zorkin's activities in September-October 1993.

"Five members of the court today demanded that Valeriy Zorkin should resign from his post as a judge," Nikolay Vitruk added. It should be noted, however, that it is for the actual judge to decide on resignation, Ernest Ametistov declared. The situation in the Constitutional Court is now critical, and this begs the question of the parallel situation: Is it possible for Boris Yeltsin to work jointly with Aleksandr Rutskoy?

Further on Dismissal

MK0212085093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 86, 2 Dec 93 (Signed to press 1 Dec) p 2

[Report by Yelena Tregubova under the "Resignation" rubric: "Powers of Valeriy Zorkin and Viktor Luchin Suspended"]

[Text] The Constitutional Court yesterday "suspended the powers" of its former chairman Valeriy Zorkin and constitutional judge Viktor Luchin "for engaging in political activity." The decision was made in the absence of Mr. Zorkin and Mr. Luchin, who declined to discuss with their former colleagues the question of their resignation. The decision regarding Valeriy Zorkin was supported by six judges with two abstentions. Five people voted to suspend the powers of Viktor Luchin; one was against and two abstained.

The ex-chairman of the Constitutional Court, who just returned from sick leave this Tuesday, told your SEGODNYA correspondent: "I have always said that the Congress in our country was an incomprehensible, lax, destabilizing organ. I am a peaceable person no matter what they are pinning on me." He explained his stance during the 3 and 4 October events thus: "We found ourselves to be hostages to extremist forces."

In the meantime, on 3 December the ex-chairman of the Constitutional Court is going to take part in a "constitutional conference" being planned by communists and "centrists" who are hoping to block the passing of the constitution in the referendum.

Zorkin Says Suspension 'Illegal'

LD0212121493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1146 GMT 2 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Pavel Kuznetsov]

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS—Ex-Constitutional Chief Justice Valeriy Zorkin qualified the decision to suspend him from office as "illegal and unlawful" because it was adopted by a court session which lacked quorum.

The Constitutional Court can adopt decision only when it has a quorum of at least two thirds of its judges while the decision to suspend him was adopted by eight judges "who had no legal right to do so", Zorkin told reporters on Thursday [2 December].

"It is possible to suspend only what has not been suspended", Zorkin said referring to an earlier presidential decree which suspended all judges of the Constitutional Court.

He believes the presidential decision was illegal as "Article 6 of the (acting Soviet-era) Constitution provides independence for the Constitutional Court".

Zorkin denied accusations that he had engaged in political activities saying he had been ill for a month and a half.

Luchin Terms Sacking 'Revenge'

LD0112220293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Constitutional Court Justice Viktor Luchin thinks that the attempts to sack him and his colleague Valeriy Zorkin were "revenge for the way we voted on the September 21 presidential decree." Their sacking was on the agenda of the Tuesday [30 November] court meeting which Luchin and Zorkin left "on principle."

Luchin told Interfax that he "deeply regretted" the position taken by those justices who pressed for their resignation because this would "result in the complete destruction of the court." He thinks that statements made by Constitutional Court Acting Chairman Nikolay Vitruk and his supporters, to the effect that the court could not function as long as Valeriy Zorkin remained in it, might suggest to the president that he should put an end to all kinds of court activities."

"Those who are pressing for this probably have been promised seats in the Federal Assembly and a new Constitutional Court by the president," Luchin thinks.

Decision on Parliamentary Chambers Reached

PM0112132593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 1

[Report by Lyubov Tsukanova: "Site Found for Parliament"]

[Text] We have already reported on the various sites for the Federal Assembly in the 25 November edition of our newspaper. Now the best site has been selected.

It is proposed that the State Duma be sited in the former CEMA [Council for Mutual Economic Assistance] building, presently the Moscow City Hall. According to the president, all necessary facilities for legislative assembly's work are present here, including 420 rooms, 40 large rooms, and 2 large halls.

The building at 26 Pushkin Street, the Russian Press House, is being assigned to the Federation Council, but where can the staffers of the 30 or so editorial offices presently occupying this building be relocated? It is proposed that their new premises be located in one of the complexes of high-rise buildings on Novyy Arbat. In comparison with all the other sites for the future Federal Assembly's chambers, the two mentioned really do have a number of advantages. First, there is their location in the city center which accords with established traditions. Second, the Federal Assembly's chambers are in relatively close proximity. The City hall (the future State Duma) is moreover situated next door to the future government building (the former Supreme Soviet) and has its own hotel. Both buildings are situated right next to main transport links.

Russia's Choice Suggests Kremlin for New Parliament

LD0112134393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1239 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Yezhov]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—The Russia's Choice election bloc proposed to seat the new parliament in the Kremlin or in the "White House" where the former Supreme Soviet used to work.

Earlier the Russian president said that the upper chamber of the new legislature would work in the House of the Press in downtown Moscow, while the lower chamber will occupy the former Comecon building, now the mayor's office, situated a couple of miles from the former.

But the Russia's Choice proposed at the consultative meeting of election blocs on Wednesday two different options. It said the parliament should be situated in a "prestigious building of historical importance and especially built for the supreme state body of the country in the Kremlin".

"In the Kremlin there is one of the best parliamentary buildings in Europe and possibilities to house the administration nearby", according to the bloc.

The bloc did not elaborate. Its proposal may concern the Grand Kremlin Palace which used to house the former Soviet parliament or the Palace of Congresses constructed especially for the Congress of the former Soviet Communist Party. It can also be the "Marble Hall" in the building No 14 where the central committee of the former Communist Party used to hold its meetings.

It is doubtful whether President Yeltsin would like to have the new parliament in the Kremlin close to his office.

The second option of the Russia's choice is the "White House" which was pounded by tanks on October 4.

New Parliament To Have Legislative Committees

LD0112142893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1336 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—"All burden of legislative work in a new parliament will be transferred to its committees which should not duplicate one another's work," Mikhail Mityukov, chairman of the Commission for Legislative Assumptions under the president of the Russian Federation," said. "Members of the commission proceed from this condition working out rules of the organization and activities of committees of the Council of the Federation and the State Duma (the lower chamber of a new Russian parliament—ITAR TASS)", Mikhail Mityukov told ITAR-TASS.

Chambers of the Federal Assembly will be absolutely autonomous, and therefore it is not envisaged to set up common committees as it was in the Supreme Soviet, the jurist stressed.

The draft regulations says that at the beginning of the first session each chamber of the Federal Assembly will establish committees for the most important directions of its activities. Some of them may carry the same names but with due account for the specific features of both chambers, for instance, committee for constitutional legislation and judicial and legal reform, committees for budget, international affairs and defense, and security. It is expedient to set up committees for internal organization of activities of each chamber. The State Duma must have a committee for a social policy, and the Council of the Federation—committee for issues dealing with the federation and a regional policy, according to jurists.

The total number of committees will be determined by deputies themselves, but Mikhail Mityukov believes that their number should not exceed 14 in each chamber. The composition of committees will also be established by chambers. However, it is supposed that a State Duma committee must include no less than 25 deputies.

Chairman of a committee and his deputy should "belong to different deputy factions and groups", Mikhail Mityukov emphasised.

Committees of the State Duma may draw representatives of ministries, other state and public bodies, and scientific institutions into the work on preparation and study of various problems. Representatives of the president and the government of the Russian Federation, as well as initiators of draft laws and all those concerned have the right to attend committees' meetings. Committees are entitled to make decisions about calling representatives of state and public organizations to a meeting and ask for all necessary documents from them.

Committees may organize hearings with participation of deputies from both chambers, officials and experts to reveal different viewpoints.

As distinct from the Supreme Soviet, commissions of chambers will have a temporary status and after fulfilling a certain task will be disbanded. A commission will be formed from members of committees.

Committees of the Council of the Federation will preliminarily consider, within their jurisdiction, laws adopted by the State Duma giving their conclusions whether they approve a law or reject it.

Chambers may set up conciliatory commissions with participation of representatives from both chambers to ascertain differences and controversial issues. "It is not admissible that one of the chambers exert pressure or take a commanding position. This is a guarantee of the efficient activities and democratic work of the entire parliament," Mikhail Mityukov stressed.

Election Issues

Constitution Draft Must Be Available to 'Every Voter'

PM0112140793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Everyone Will Read the Constitution"]

[Text] Vladimir Shumeyko and Nikolay Ryabov, who addressed a telephone linkup staged by the Central Electoral Commission yesterday, called on everyone involved in the organization of the election campaign to devote more of their attention to the preparations for and staging of the nationwide vote on the draft new Russian Constitution.

Nikolay Ryabov announced that an extra 20 million copies of the draft Constitution would be urgently printed and sent out to the electoral districts. The conference instructed administration heads and the mass media to urgently elaborate organizational measures to ensure that the text of the draft Constitution reaches every Russian family and every voter.

Election Contenders Quoted on Constitution

PM0112150193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 1

[Untitled, unattributed feature under the "What People Say and Declare" rubric]

[Text] Gennadiy Burbulis, "Russia's Choice" bloc:

"You can deplore as much as you like the fact that normal legislative power is missing from the basic articles of the Constitution and that it was written in the absence of a parliament in the country. But today it is necessary to find the courage to admit that a boycott of the Constitution is dangerous for the country, destructive to its future, and unacceptable from the viewpoint of the development of democratic processes.

"If elected to parliament, I will try to ensure that the Federal Assembly adopts a decision to preserve Boris Yeltsin's powers for the whole presidential term and that simultaneous reelections both of the president and of parliament are held in the spring of 1996."

Aleksandr Shokhin, Party of Russian Unity and Accord:

"The trouble is not so much that the state and the treasury have insufficient funds to maintain the Army and to place large defense orders. The trouble is the existence of a factor of uncertainty."

Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, "Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin" bloc:

"I see no definite steps in the direction of reforms on the part of the present government. This applies to tax policy as well. Taxes are so high in our country that nobody pays them. Since nobody pays them, the government increases taxes once again. Once again nobody pays them. A vicious circle. In my view the most acceptable level for taxes is 35-40 percent, so that everyone both pays them and is enabled to develop production."

Kostikov Denies Yeltsin Against Criticism of Constitution

LD0112180793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1601 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—Recent publications and statements by some public figures claim that Russian President Boris Yeltsin admits of no criticism of the draft constitution. This reflects neither the position nor the opinion of the president, Yeltsin's spokesman Vyacheslav Kostikov said in a statement on Wednesday [1 December].

The draft constitution submitted to the referendum is the fruit of tremendous efforts and the result of all-Russia political creativity. Its adoption will anticipate Russia's future for a long-term strategic perspective and direct the fate of its people along the democratic national path, the statement said. Constructive criticism of the constitution is a normal manifestation of the positions of parties, groupings and political leaders. It is obvious that the constitution, as a democratic instrument of state

construction and regulation of social and political life, will be inevitably changed and perfected.

Criticism of the constitution is not inadmissible. What is inadmissible is its total rejection by forces seeking narrow-party egoism and political revenge, as well as nihilistic revision of the long-suffering constitutional process through which Russia has gone in the last few years, Kostikov said.

The final verdict on the draft constitution will have to be brought by people. They will have a chance to do so in the referendum on December 12, the statement said.

Sirotkin: New Constitution Can Protect Human Rights

LD0112152193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1406 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—The interpretation of human rights and freedoms in the draft of a new Russian constitution "meets international standards", said on Wednesday [1 December] Sergey Sirotkin, deputy chairman of the Human Rights Commission under the Russian president, speaking at a news conference in the Moscow press house.

He expressed confidence that "if Russia has a high level of human rights protection, corresponding to the new constitution, it will become a democratic country".

Describing the commission's position, Sirotkin admitted that human rights in the Russian Federation "are ensured not to the full, above all in the socio-economic sphere".

However, he pointed to an encouraging factor: The Russian leadership "honestly recognises these problems and makes attempts to tackle them".

The establishment by the president of the Human Rights Commission for the transition period, after the Russian parliament was disbanded, confirms this assertion, Sirotkin claimed.

He said that the second section of the draft constitution—human rights and freedoms—is the best as to the level of guarantees. However, the most difficult task is to ensure their implementation. Therefore, "the most important developments will start after December 12".

Sirotkin expressed confidence that Russian people will support the constitution at the referendum. Its approval will necessitate a huge amount of legislative work, including "gigantic cleanup of present-day legislation".

The new legislature has to review, for instance, the laws on militia, federal security bodies, investigative activities and the procurator's office. According to Sirotkin, the above laws protect departmental interests rather than human rights.

Sirotkin claimed that the new parliament "should be free from departmental lobbyism which railroaded its laws, as was the case with the old parliament".

Minister Says Constitution To Be Adopted

LD0112153793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1423 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—The majority of Russians will support the draft constitution in the upcoming nation-wide referendum on December 12, Russian Social Welfare Minister Ella Panfilova said on Wednesday.

People are tired of instability and understand that the new fundamental law will bring peace to their life, Panfilova told journalists.

She said a nation-wide poll is the best form of adoption of the new constitution. It will help "provide for normal functioning of a law-governed state," she added.

Panfilova, who is a member of the Russia's Choice election bloc, said her bloc does not support Russian Vice-Prime Minister Vladimir Shumeyko's appeal to the Central Electoral Commission to bar the Communist and the Democratic Parties from the elections and to study all the cases of anti-constitutional propaganda by four other electoral blocs.

She said the appeal was "his personal initiative." Shumeyko is head of the governmental commission for the referendum on the draft constitution.

Asked about the split in the democratic camp on the eve of the elections, Panfilova said she hopes for "understanding among the deputies of the Federal Assembly." She believes a "nation-wide unity for the benefit of Russia's interests is possible." She stressed that Yegor Gaydar and Grigoriy Yavlinskiy "could find a common language on the main issues and then start arguing about inflation," while democrats "are tripping each other up, people like (Vladimir) Zhirinovskiy are gaining points," Panfilova said.

Zorkin on Election, Ban on Criticizing Yeltsin

MK0112141093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Dec 93 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Valeriy Zorkin, former Constitutional Court chairman, by Radik Batyrshin; place and date not given; from the "Constitution" column: "'There Will Be No Free Elections,' Constitutional Court Ex-Chairman Valeriy Zorkin Is Sure"]

[Text] [Batyrshin] Valeriy Dmitriyevich, which constitution are you defending today?

[Zorkin] I have sworn to defend the Constitution, and I have done it until the end, as long as the situation in the country has allowed. If there is a new constitution and I am a justice, I will defend the new Fundamental Law just

as well. There is no other way; otherwise there will be chaos, arbitrariness, and dictatorship.

[Batyrshin] How do you relate to the mechanism of adopting the new constitution?

[Zorkin] A constitution is never adopted by 25 percent of the population. This provision contains a time bomb. Supposing a new ruler comes along and says: This Fundamental Law has been adopted without the participation of the majority of the population. The new constitution should at the very least be passed by a majority of registered voters, not of the turnout. In that event, incidentally, the Law on the Referendum, signed by the president, would not be violated.

The same goes for the principle of separation of powers. I regard it as a synthetic notion, envisioning that power is divided between several bodies on a checks and balances basis, ensuring a democratic form of government and a rule of law state so that no branch of power may be absolute. The draft constitution does not provide for such a balance. The president, under the draft, is head of state and at the same time he forms and dismisses the government—and he may also dismiss the State Duma if does not come to reason. Moreover, he works out the foundations of the country's domestic and foreign policy. When I read this section, it was like the old Russian song: "I felt a sudden breath of bygone days"—the breath of Article 6 of the Constitution about the CPSU's leading role. At that time there was a whole party, but now there is just one man.

[Batyrshin] Critics of this draft also point to the section of the federal structure....

[Zorkin] Maybe it would be ideal to grant all components equal rights, like in the United States, but what we are confronted with is not an ideal future but an asymmetric federation that has adopted a federation treaty. This treaty was signed not only by the Federation components but also by Boris Yeltsin and Ruslan Khasbulatov. Now the federation treaty has been thrown away and all are equal. It seems that they are playing up to the krays and oblasts: we understand you. In fact, though, this draft constitution does not upgrade the components' powers but equates them before the bureaucratic centralized authority. Because this bias in favor of a one-man rule will result in a situation where federal relations will not work. Moreover, the republics, offended that they have been thus cast aside, will provide fertile ground for nationalism. In my opinion, the absence of a balance between the president and the parliament at the federal level will lead to this imbalance automatically transferring to the regions, and then bureaucratic centralization will move along like a steamroller.

The same goes for the absence of qualifications on the number of components required to pass the constitution. All the rhetoric about Russia's being a system of regions has proven to be false. In fact there was a totalitarian-bureaucratic-centralized microbe which has now made itself felt. I am a proponent of a strong state but I think that a genuine federative Russian state must be created. All the sprouts of federalism have been cast aside, and in their place they intend to create a bureaucratic centralized state. This is reminiscent of shock therapy in the economy. Everyone knows how that ended. I think that shock therapy in building an ideal federation will end in the same way. This political wiliness [tryukachestvo] will seriously affect Russia's future.

[Batyrshin] How do you relate to the ban on criticizing the draft constitution in TV speeches by candidates for the Federal Assembly?

[Zorkin] The deputy candidates are being forced into a constitutional system of some kind. The attitude to the constitution is the foundation of their election platform. To ban criticism of the draft constitution means to ban free elections and to ban freedom in Russia. Therefore one may only praise it in order to get access to the feeding trough. Excuse me, but what about Orwell then?

I get the impression that there are no free elections. I drive in the morning and they tell me: "Vote for Russia's Choice." I drive in the evening and I hear the same. And at night they say: The constitution or the president may not be criticized. What is freedom then? I do not know whether the president understands the meaning of "the constitution may not be criticized." Maybe it must be criticized, identifying its weak aspects and asking the Federation components. They were asked after the Federation Treaty was thrown overboard, i.e., by spitting in their face after all the summer talk to the effect that the regions will be the main buttress of Russia.

[Batyrshin] Which of the election blocs evokes your sympathy?

[Zorkin] I can only say that unless a positive coalition of moderate (not opposition) forces emerges in Russia that stops any extremes, enforces order and justice, and undertakes real transformations, with a strong statehood, taking account of Russia's diversity in the federative aspect, nothing good will come to this country.

[Batyrshin] But representatives of all blocs are advocating this....

[Zorkin] I think that it is not words but deeds that matter....

[Batyrshin] What is the future fate of the Constitutional Court?

[Zorkin] The same as the fate of the constitutional system in Russia. If there is no genuine constitution based on the principle of separation of powers, firmly guaranteed citizens' rights and a genuine federation, the Constitutional Court will be a pathetic semblance of some body.

[Batyrshin] Will you work in this "pathetic semblance""

[Zorkin] We shall live and see.

Yavlinskiy Bloc Calls For Debate on Constitution 5 Dec

LD0112183893 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Dec 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The press service of the Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin bloc announced today its proposal for all electoral associations to hold an open discussion of the Russian draft constitution on 5 December, with the attendance of the public and the mass media. Representatives of the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms, the Democratic Party of Russia, and the Russia's Choice bloc have already agreed in principle to take part in a discussion of this kind.

Shumeyko Remarks on Constitution Criticism Viewed

PM0112161193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 2

[Report by Otto Latsis: "V. Shumeyko Divides Parties Disloyal to Draft Constitution Into Two Types"]

[Text] It is hard for the voter right now. Elections based on party lists are to be held for the first time in our life. For the first time there will be a Federal Assembly instead of the customary Supreme Soviet. It is also the first time that he will have to adopt for himself a new Constitution, at the referendum. And there is a further innovation—the arbitration court. How to assimilate all the new rules, how to understand the very criteria determining these rules?

Meanwhile there is a new enigma: The Central Electoral Commission says: You cannot criticize the draft constitution and if you do we will turn off the microphone. But how can we discuss it if we cannot criticize it and what kind of a democratic choice is it at the referendum without discussion? Perhaps the opposition is right and a dictatorship really is being imposed on me? No, there are different reasons, Vladimir Shumeyko, chairman of the commission for holding the referendum, explained by the evening of 29 November (less than two weeks before the vote!). Everyone can criticize and discuss everything but they must know their own conscience. The Federal Assembly to which we are electing deputies seemingly does not yet exist in law. It is envisaged only by the president's edict on the elections. The legislative basis for its existence will only be created by the Constitution, which is to be introduced by referendum on election day itself. Therefore those candidates who criticize the constitution as regards the Federal Assembly—its role, structure and functions—and at the same time want to become deputies of this assembly on the basis of the Constitution itself are not acting very honestly. Withdraw your candidacy and you can criticize to your heart's content.

That is logical, the voter is prepared to conclude, but one cannot stop thinking that V. Shumeyko, the chairman of the commission for the referendum, having explained one question, has given rise to a mass of new ones to which he has not given a reply. His statement divides the parties guilty of disloyalty to the Constitution into two types. It is proposed to remove Zyuganov's Communist Party of the Russian Federation and Travkin's Democratic Party of Russia "from the field" immediately: to remove their party lists from the ballot, and it is proposed to wave a finger at Yavlinskiy's bloc, the Agrarian Union, the "Civic Union," and the "New Names." What are the criteria for this differentiation? And more important, what legal bases are there for what V. Shumeyko proposes? Let us suppose that I find it logical to denounce the doublethink of those candidate who want to reject the Constitution and at the same time become deputies on its basis. This doublethinking gives sufficient grounds for denouncing them to the voters and depriving them of free television time at the state's expense. But a legal basis is required for a sanction like removing from the voting a party list which has collected the specified number of signatures from voters and has been registered according to the rules. We must indicate on the basis of what law and what paragraph of this law this is being done. Simple logic proving the candidates' lack of ethics is not enough here—it is too reminiscent of the notorious "revolutionary law awareness."

...But Zhirinovskiy once again can do everything. Each word of his election program is in flagrant contradiction with the democratic spirit and letter of the draft Constitution. Almost each election speech of his contains the grossest violations of political ethics, but he beats his breast and says: I am for the Constitution. And that is accepted as sufficient grounds for him to have no problems?

Top Officials Express Optimism for New Constitution

LD0112211493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1956 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—The interpretation of the rights and freedoms in the draft new constitution "meets international standards," Sergey Sirotkin, deputy chairman of the Commission for Human Rights under the Russian president, said.

Speaking at a news conference in the House of the Press in Moscow on Wednesday [1 December], Sirotkin expressed the hope that "if the level of protection of the rights in Russia is adequate to its constitution, it (Russia) will become a democratic country."

He said human rights "are not fully ensured, primarily in the social and economic sphere" in Russia. However, he described as a positive factor the fact that the country's leadership "honestly admits the existence of these problems and is making attempts to solve them."

Sirotkin expressed the hope that Russians will support the constitution in the upcoming referendum.

Russian Social Welfare Minister Ella Panfilova shared his hopes, saying that the majority of Russians will

support the draft constitution in the upcoming nationwide referendum on December 12.

People are tired of instability and understand that the new fundamental law will bring peace to their life, Panfilova told journalists.

She said a nation-wide poll is the best form of adoption of the new constitution. It will help "provide for normal functioning of a law-governed state," she added.

Panfilova, who is a member of the Russia's Choice election bloc, said her bloc does not support Russian Vice-Prime Minister Vladimir Shumeyko's appeal to the Central Electoral Commission to bar the communist and the democratic parties from the elections and to study all the cases of anti-constitutional propaganda by four other electoral blocs.

She said the appeal was "his personal initiative." Shumeyko is head of the governmental commission for the referendum on the draft constitution.

Asked about the split in the democratic camp on the eve of the elections, Panfilova said she hopes for "understanding among the deputies of the Federal Assembly." She believes a "nation-wide unity for the benefit of Russia's interests is possible." She stressed that Yegor Gaydar and Grigoriy Yavlinskiy "could find a common language on the main issues and then start arguing about inflation." While democrats "are tripping each other up, people like (Vladimir) Zhirinovskiy are gaining points," Panfilova said.

Russia's Choice Figures Welcome Court Ruling

LD0112152293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1316 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Ivanova]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Dec— At its sitting today, the Information Arbitration Court confirmed the right of election candidates to decide for themselves what goes into their pre-election speeches, a right implicit in the clause on election campaigning. The court found that speakers have the right to express their opinion on the Russian Federation's draft constitution. The court therefore deems that the address to the Central Electoral Commission by Vladimir Shumeyko, chairman of the government commission for the referendum on the Russian Federation's draft constitution, about campaigning in connection with the draft consitution "is not in line with legislation on election campaigning."

Members of the Arbitration Court found that the legislative restrictions relate to the correctness of opinions expressed by candidates. Candidates are not allowed to go beyond the framework of the election campaign in their speeches, to devote most of a speech to criticism of other election platforms, and so on.

A representative of the Russia's Choice bloc, Sergey Yushenkov, announced earlier that "each party has the inalienable right to campaign for or against the new draft constitution".

Russia's Choice considers "the very examination of the issue of banning electoral associations from speaking against the draft constitution "unacceptable", and other members of the bloc supported this statement.

"Shumeyko's recent speech in favor of limiting the right of electoral associations to criticize the draft new constitution should be regarded simply as the action of an official, along with any call to vote against it," says Gennadiy Burbulis, a leader of Russia's Choice. "It would be wrong to associate Shumeyko's statement with any party or electoral bloc," he said.

Chairman of the government commission for the referendum on the draft new constitution, Vladimir Shumeyko, earlier sent a letter to the Central Electoral Commission accusing a number of electoral associations of active campaigning against the proposed draft new Basic Law and requesting that they be removed from the election campaign.

The Central Electoral Commission is expected to make an official statement on Friday 3 December.

Russia's Choice Accused of Using Foreign Funds for Campaign

LD0112152993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1452 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Pavel Bogdanov]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—Aleksandr Vladislavlev, vice-president of the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs, called on Wednesday [1 December] to look into the allegations against the Russia's Choice bloc saying it was using funds from foreign sponsors for its election campaign.

Speaking on behalf of the Civic Union at a press conference dealing with the situation in the country in the run-up to the December 12 poll, Vladislavlev cited excerpts from an article in THE WASHINGTON TIMES accusing Russia's Choice of using funds from the U.S. International Development Agency for at least part of its campaign advertising on tv.

Under the regulations on elections, candidates are banned from using funds from foreign sponsors for campaign purposes.

Civic Union Accuses Russia's Choice of U.S. Financing

LD0112221793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Russia's Civic Union in the Name of Stability, Justice, and Progress has demanded that the Central

Election Commission find out the source of Russia's Choice electoral bloc's funds.

The Civic Union issued a statement on Wednesday [1 December] saying THE WASHINGTON TIMES recently carried a story which suggested that "at least part of the television campaigning carried out by Russia's Choice was financed with funds which the U.S. agency for International Development pays Russian television for the propaganda of Russia's privatization program." There have been other reports to that effect in the foreign media, the Civic Union says.

It quotes Clause 3 of Article 32 of the Regulations on Elections to the State Duma, approved by the president, which reads: "The reception of donations from foreign States, organizations or citizens, from Russian corporations possessing foreign capital and from international organizations and international public associations shall be prohibited."

The Civic Union calls on all electoral associations to back its demand to the Central Election Commission and "express their protest against gross violations of the rules of the election campaign and foreign interference in it."

Media Ban on Pre-Election Opinion Polls Explained

LD0112173093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1625 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Ivanova]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—In accordance with a statute on elections of deputies to the State Duma and the Federation Council, a ban has been imposed on making public the results of public opinion polls connected with elections. The ban comes into force at 00:00 December 2.

Secretary of the Russian court of arbitration, Vladimir Sukhomlinov, said that the ban would be in effect only as regards data featuring figures and percentage rates.

Sukhomlinov connects this legally substantiated decision with the fact that some public opinion polls inadequately reflect the public opinion. Sukhomlinov pointed out that the matter concerns only those polls which are directly connected with the forthcoming elections, while results of sociological polls on other problems may be published by the press and broadcast by radio and television.

Sukhomlinov pointed out that the ban would remain in force until 24:00, December 12. The responsibility for complying with the demand rests with heads of editorial offices of the mass media, Sukhomlinov added.

TV Chief Poptsov Defends Election Coverage

PM0212105793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 4

[Article by Oleg Poptsov, chairman of the All-Russian State Television and Radio Company: "Harder To Keep Quiet Than To Speak"]

[Text] One week of television airtime for showing off election blocs and parties has passed. And more and more people in the media are saying that television, by "farming out" airtime, has ruled itself out of participation in the election campaign, thus depriving the viewer of the chance to gain a deeper insight into the election platforms.

It is the first time we have had multiparty elections in our country. This in itself creates certain difficulties. But all the previous practice of elections, including television practice, shows that we have no concept of the proper way to conduct debates as such. Then again, there was none in the parliament. We spent three years watching a tragicomic theater performance. The air of suspicion that is so typical of our political life is preventing a normal dialogue on the air. After each attempt the endless recriminations begin—how provocative this or that particular question was, being seen primarily as a desire to discredit the party or its leader. We also see parties and blocs being intolerably capricious. The proposed airtime schedule was changed three times during the preparations and the times we suggested were rejected several times.

But it cannot be said that television has kowtowed to anyone or obediently accepted terms imposed by someone. We must recognize that the airtime allotted to the parties is their time and they can use it as they see fit. This is a democratic norm. Yes, we favored tough legislative regulation. But the gist of it was that no one could abuse the airwaves. At the same time, Russian Television offered the widest range of opportunities for effective campaigning. During the preparations, when paid airtime was being discussed, various types of broadcast were considered: television debates, interviews, press conferences. The relevant forms of studio layout were also prepared. Moreover, being fully aware of the complexity of the dialogue method of work, we even proposed a preliminary discussion of the quesrions with the opponents. And what did we find? The parties were categorically opposed to this.

Basically, everyone must be very well aware that in polemics it is best to try to show that you are right. And what polemics! Some parties come to the television studio with their own presenters, reckoning that this way they will be able to open up better to the viewer. But their "own people" do not give them an opportunity to open up. You just get something akin to mating display by birds where the male is deaf to everything but his own song. As a result the viewer loses interest in performances of this kind.

I think it all stems from a misconception of the way to propagandize one's ideas. The problem our wonderful party leaders have is that they think that viewer and voter are one and the same. A bad mistake. The viewer has yet to become a voter. Remember the appearance by A. Volskiy, which, in my view, was ineffective as far as his party was concerned. God forbid, I am not criticizing his program and I have every respect for him. But if I were he I would have telephoned the television studio and said: "Give us a couple of good journalists, let them sit opposite and give us some exciting crosstalk." Then the spot would be juicy, interesting, and unexpected. The same goes for Zyuganov's party, and for "Russia's Choice," which thinks it is achieving enormous success with its promotional video. But the ingenious ploy is only impressive first time round and playing it again and again defeats the object. When Stanislav Govorukhin attracts attention as a movie director, it does not mean he is attracting voters' sympathies. Attention and sympathies are entirely different things. Someone who shouts for help also attracts attention....

I will mention another mistake that pervades the election campaign—criticism of an opponent is by no means the quickest way to the voter's heart. The main thing is to win him over, to open your heart to him. They say journalists should help. But tomorrow they will be accused of trying to bury rather than reveal the candidate or party. The parties must want it in the first place, there must be a potential for revelation. Only in the bazaar are the buds opened by hand, and then they also stick wire down the stalk to make the flower stand up for a while. But here even such a virtuoso leader as Zhirinovskiy is scared of having an opponent. Vladimir Volfovich personally insisted on delivering a monologue.

I am prepared to take the criticisms made of television. But I will say once again that when the rules were being devised no one deferred to another; it was a consultation process and everything was explained and discussed. But the fears happened to outweigh the trust. The Central Electoral Commission was afraid of making a mistake, of entering into confrontation with the parties before the start of the election campaign.

But why are we afraid of saying: "OK, here we are and here are our parties and blocs." Do not be afraid of things that are natural; you have to see things for what they are.

But at the same time, Russian Television is prepared to radically change the form of election appearances at any time. If the parties so wish. People are mistaken if they think that television has made things cushy for itself. It is harder for a journalist to keep quiet than to speak.

Commission Imposes Media Ban on Election Polls

LD0112144693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1336 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Moscow, 1 Dec (ITAR-TASS)—The publication of opinion polls connected with the forthcoming parliamentary election in Russia is banned for 10 days, starting at midnight tonight. The ban applies equally to newspapers, television and radio.

This announcement was made today by the Central Electoral Commission. It cited the regulations for the 1993 elections to the State Duma and the Federation Council, which set out the arrangements and schedule for election measures involving the mass media.

The commission says that the ban must be strictly observed. Responsibility for compliance rests with editorial executives in the mass media.

Democratic Blocs May Campaign Together Against Revanchists

LD0112152793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1412 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Anna Melnikova]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—"Democratic forces might campaign together to prevent revanchist forces from being elected to parliament," said Sergey Stankevich, a presidential adviser and member of the Federal Council of the Party of Russian Unity and Accord (PRUA), at a news conference today.

He said that PRUA had been holding consultations with the "Russia's Choice" bloc, the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms and the "Yavlinski-Boldyrev-Lukin" bloc.

"Consultations are being held in a friendly atmosphere allowing to hope for successful coordinated activities," Stankevich added.

Election Buildup Viewed as Nominations Close

PM0112132793 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 1

[Report by Vladimir Khrustov: "A Total of 3,822 Candidates Registered. Just 628 Federal Assembly Deputies Set To Be Elected"]

[Text] Central Electoral Commission Chairman Nikolay Ryabov conducted a telephone conference with representatives of district electoral commissions, leaders of the executive organs of power of Federation components, and the leaders of communications facilities, transport networks, internal affairs and other organizations 30 November in the Russian Federation Ministry of Communications. The particulars of the closing stage of the election campaign, including the holding of the ballot 12 December, were discussed.

Vladimir Shumeyko, first deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers, Vladimir Bulgak, Russian Federation Communications Minister, and leaders of ministries and departments, the Central Electoral Commission, and Moscow's district electoral commissions were present in the studio in Moscow.

"It is essential for us today," Nikolay Ryabov said, opening the conference, "to think through all the details of work over the next 12 days in order to complete in a

worthy manner the enormous effort made by the Central Electoral Commission in cooperation with the executive organs of power."

The Central Electoral Commission chairman briefly recapped on what has been done already. The nomination of candidates is over, their registration has ended.

As of today there are in the Russian Federation 490 contenders for seats in the Federation Council and 1,577 for seats in the State Duma. In addition, 1,756 candidate deputies have registered in the all-Federation electoral district. A total of 3,822 candidates have registered for the Federation Assembly. It is indicative that they include 209 former Russian Federation people's deputies.

There are just three dual-mandate districts out of 89 where Federal Council elections will not take place (Tatar District No. 16, Chechnya District No. 20, and Chelyabinsk District No. 74). Polling day for the State Duma elections is also having to be postponed in one district (Naberezhnyye Chelny District No. 25, Republic of Tatarstan).

In terms of background it is a most varied body of candidates. Over 40 percent are leaders of executive power bodies, 16.8 percent are personnel from representative structures, 15.5 percent are entrepreneurs, and 2.5 percent are persons engaged in juridical practice and working in the administrative organs.

Among the candidates standing for election to the State Duma, 20 percent are representatives of the executive at various levels including federal, 22 percent are workers from commercial structures, and 10 percent are representatives of higher education and the sciences.

In short, the complement of contenders for deputies' mandates affords the hope that the new parliament will be genuinely professional and capable of resolving its constitutional tasks in a worthy manner.

Nikolay Ryabov drew the attention of conference participants to yet another important circumstance. The entire course of the election campaign, the dynamism of each of its stages, has been directed toward the battle for deputies' mandates, and the rivalry between parties and politicians has seemed at times to push concern for holding the ballot on the draft new Constitution into the background. This cannot be condoned, he stressed. On the contrary, right now the greatest attention must be given to preparing and holding the referendum. It is necessary to take all measures in order to rear people toward participating in the universal ballot on the Constitution, and to create propitious conditions for them to do this. Only then will they go to the polling booths and make their choice.

Nikolay Ryabov stressed as a matter of principle the duty of the mass media (the founders of which include state organs, organizations, establishments, and organs of local self-management, as well as those media sources financed out of state funds) to guarantee equal coverage for all candidates' election speeches.

According to information coming in from Russia's regions, the large detachment of election campaign mediators is launching into its work—they are the district commissions (of which there are over 95,000). Their main concern today is the collation of electoral lists and the preparation in conjunction with local executive organs of premises for voting.

Questions concerning the participation in the elections of servicemen, including those abroad, sailors, polar explorers, and other categories of Russian absent for whatever reason from their place of permanent residence on election day, have virtually been resolved.

At the same time, information coming in to the electoral commission from the localities proves that in many of Russia's regions the turnout of voters in the elections could be low owing to problems in the socioeconomic sphere.

Parties' Stance on Army Issues Surveyed

PM0212111193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Dec 93 p 2

[Article by Vladimir Yermolin under the "Elections" rubric: "Army Card of Blocs and Parties"]

[Text] There is a direct or indirect military aspect to the election programs of practically all 13 electoral associations and blocs. For perfectly understandable reasons, the Agrarian Party of Russia, the "Women of Russia," and the "Cedar" constructive ecological movement have not set themselves the aim of covering defense issues in their programs. This certainly should not be interpreted as total indifference to problems of the state's armed defense on the part of the aforesaid associations. Agreeing with the need to further reform the Army and Navy, they advocate maintaining a level of combat readiness of the Armed Forces which will ensure the Russians' normal life and deliver them from the threat of attack from without.

The "Dignity and Charity" electoral association is understanding of the essence of army problems. The bloc of the Democratic Party of Russia (Travkin-Govorukhin-Bogomolov) also displays a high degree of respect for the "man with a rifle" and attention to his problems.

Concern with army problems can be perceived in the program documents of the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia. Vladimir Zhirinovskiy and his colleagues deem it necessary to pursue a course independent of the West in foreign policy, a course founded on Russia's national and geopolitical interests.

The conceptual difference between the "military aspect" of the election program of "Russia's Choice" and that of the Liberal Democratic Party's program consists in the fact that "Gaydar's team," regarding the West as a potential ally, advocates the integration of the military might of Russia and the West in a unified security system. "Russia's Choice" believes that Russia's natural partners and allies are the economically developed democratic countries and also those states which aim to ensure democracy and steady

economic growth. Here is another determining point: "We must strive for a situation whereby Russia's security will be an object of concern not only to itself but also to the whole community of developed states." Hence the need for "all-around defense" no longer arises. In the opinion of "Russia's Choice," we need "a professional army, qualified, mobile, and technically advanced."

A worldwide, an all-European, and a regional security system are advocated by the bloc of the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms, which favors formulating a concept of defense reliability and sufficiency and a program of defense orders and military scientific research work. The movement deems it expedient to establish open and effective control over the production, importation, and exportation of weapons and military equipment. The proceeds from arms sales must be used primarily to resolve "the Army's housing and social problems, for training and retraining programs, and to employ discharged military professionals in market economy spheres."

The "Russia's Future-New Names" electoral association believes that "national security must be ensured not by the level of armament but by the degree of development of the scientific and technical potential." There is no cause for argument here, since the former is directly dependent on the latter. But it is very opportune to recall the now sickly scientific and technical potential of the defense industry. All the election programs speak of the need to conduct the conversion process sensibly. From this it is possible to conclude that there is no longer any need to be concerned about the future of the military-industrial complex.

Communists see the guarantee of Russia's security in the speediest conclusion of an interstate treaty on an economic, diplomatic, and defense alliance of countries—the former republics of the USSR. They regard the current military reform as the "destruction of defense," particularly with regard to manpower acquisition. The social problems of the Army and the Navy are being resolved extremely slowly. Communists believe that the residue principle for supplying the Armed Forces with everything they need is simply inadmissible.

Incidentally, this is the belief not only of Communists, for representatives of the majority of the electoral blocs say and write that the living standards of servicemen must be commensurate with the level of the lofty tasks facing them. True, I will allow myself a small digression. Among those who today demonstrate an understanding of everyday army life there are many who never found the time to lighten this everyday life while they held the levers of real power. I will not name names, for each of us has his own experience here.

The program statements of the "Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin" bloc also contain their own view of the "military aspect." "Yabloko" sees the political settlement of armed conflicts around Russia as a priority task. If we fail to do this in time, the conflagration will move onto Russian soil. A defense alliance among the CIS countries is needed. Legal regulation of the status of Russian troops abroad is needed. At a recent news conference held by the bloc's representatives it was said that doctrinal enshrinement of the Army's involvement in resolving internal conflicts is clearly wrong.

In general, all the blocs and associations agreed here that it is not the Army's job to supplant internal troops and the militia. In this case the reflection of the recent tragic events in Moscow could be perceived clearly. All proved unanimous on one other point: The Army must not adopt political decisions and must not be drawn into internal political "altercations" in the country. Mr. Zhirinovskiy has publicly advocated sending the Army in to fight banditry, but the position of those who deem it necessary to combat crime by reinforcing internal troops and special subunits of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Security is nonetheless closer to my heart. It is difficult for the Army, with its might, to punish selectively under urban conditions.

The attitude of the Party of Russian Unity and Accord [PRUA] to the Armed Forces is set forth at length. The PRUA's attitude toward the Army's manpower acquisition is traditional for the democratic wing: As the economic conditions are created, it is necessary to make the transition to a professional army (on a contract basis), but for the present it is necessary to preserve the existing procedure of the draft and military service obligation for citizens. The PRUA also advocates the introduction of alternative service. The "party of Shakhray" today regards as the priority areas the reinforcement and building of the Internal Troops and the Russian Federation Border Guard Troops. There are also specific proposals for strengthening the defense industry: To draw up the military order and convey it to defense enterprises no later than the third quarter of the current year, to advance at the beginning of the budget year up to one-half of the value of the state military order which has been placed, to approve a long-term program for upgrading the Russian Army's weapons and equipment, thereby setting clear-cut guidelines for conversion....

Arkadiy Volskiy's bloc, which includes quite a few prominent specialists in the military-industrial complex and production leaders, also advocates a solicitous, state attitude to the defense industry and its scientific and technical potential.

On reading the programs of the blocs and associations and listening to the candidates' speeches on television, you notice a high degree of understanding of the importance of the Armed Forces in the life of society. Regardless of political aspirations, moreover. All agree that Russia needs a strong, technically advanced, excellently armed army. All deem it inadmissible to economize on defense. All advocate resolving the military person's social problems. All advocate the serviceman's lofty social status. It only remains to hope that at least some of the promises generously being given out at the stage of the election struggle will be carried out. After all, they all seem to be well aware that the state's defense capability is not an object for political games, since concern will have to be shown for it after 12 December as well.

Russia's Choice Distances Itself From Shumeyko

MK0212094093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 86, 2 Dec 93 (Signed to press 1 Dec) p 2

[Report by Sergey Parkhomenko under the "Scandal" rubric: "Who Will Pay for Shumeyko? 'Russia's Choice' Starts Thinking About the 'Purity of Party Ranks'"]

[Text] When asked by SEGODNYA to comment on a sensational initiative put forward by a candidate to the Federation Council who is running under the banner of "Russia's Choice" in Kaliningrad Oblast, Yegor Gaydar said carefully: "Of course, the bloc does not rule out the possibility of taking off the ballot candidates or associations campaigning on platforms that violate the principle of law and order and propagate a fascist ideology, but we do not think that taking blocs that criticize the constitution off the ballot is lawful. At any rate, the bloc has not made such decisions..."

Garri Kasparov, who does not hold any government posts and hence appears to be somewhat more relaxed, described Vladimir Shumeyko's action as "irresponsibility bordering on provocation." "It is plainly clear," Kasparov continued, "that it is an individual political game of a certain person that we are dealing with, but it will have to be paid for by the entire bloc. Of course, the term "party discipline" sticks in our craw, but the bloc's shared interests do exist and should be respected by all. If formerly it looked as if in our ranks there were only differences of approaches, now political objectives themselves apparently are starting to vary.... I am sure of this, even if they throw me out of 'Choice' after this statement..."

Gennadiy Burbulis, speaking with journalists in the lobby during a meeting of electoral blocs, had to state on behalf of "Russia's Choice:" "We apologize for Shumeyko as our colleague... His action was prompted by office considerations and we condemn it..." In the same breath he put forward an initiative to send something like a collective letter to the president defending the right of all candidates to criticize the draft constitution.

Meanwhile, reports are coming from the presidential administration that an attempt will be made soon, by methods that have already become familiar, to hush up the embarrassment. According to a presidential adviser, an official communique is being drawn up in the Kremlin describing Mr. Shumeyko's faux pas as his purely personal initiative that does not have anything to do with Boris Yeltsin's stance.

Those who witnessed the recent meeting in the Kremlin with leaders of electoral blocs recall that Yeltsin reproached the most vigorous critics of the draft constitution in a fairly polite and even cautious manner. The president allegedly reminded the audience that it is in fact the state itself that had put forward the constitutional initiative and it would not like the critics of the draft fundamental law to use air time paid by that same state for this purpose. Free access to television was given to the blocs so that they could advertise themselves, Boris Yeltsin insisted. If anyone wants to use criticism of the constitution, the president's policy, and anything or anyone else for campaigning purposes—he is free to do so, but, please, at his own expense.

If the president actually adopted this stance (the account above appears to be rendering it fairly trustworthily), then it becomes plain that Mr. Shumeyko, in trying to protect his patron's peace and quiet, has greatly overdone it.

Still, it would be unfair not to recall that the credit for creating the syllogism of overwhelming elegance and power—whereby the very fact of a candidate's registering for the State Duma race is interpreted as his pledging to support the draft constitution—should not go to Vladimir Shumeyko at all. This invention was made—or at least made public—by Anatoliy Sliva, a chief of the State Legal Administration. Similar tones were heard later in a number of public statements by Aleksandr Kotenkov, top chief of the administration. Hence, what we are witnessing is evidently not an isolated incident of an illness but a whole epidemic, albeit, fortunately, still of a limited scale. The tranquillity displayed by the head of state, who did not rush to carry out an urgent disinfection of his office in order to kill the dangerous virus of demagoguery, could have easily be taken for a tacit approval...

At any rate, it is clear that Boris Yeltsin will be unable to restrain the desire of candidates for State Duma seats "to fiddle" with his Constitution. All the more so because he himself has tied the parliamentary elections and the referendum on the Constitution into a single political knot.

On the contrary, the more intensive and fussier the attempts to improve the rules of the electoral struggle by administrative methods, the stronger the temptation for the ruling regime's opponents to use the theme of "pressure and discrimination by the authorities" in their campaign. The best illustration of these effects is an urgent gathering of foreign observers who have already come to Russia by Nikolay Travkin at his head office, which amounted to a precise and prompt response to "Shumeyko's letter."

Correspondingly, the faster the current political capital will be frittered away by "Russia's Choice," which will apparently have to pay for the honor and privilege of having on its list of candidates the highest-ranking officials who display an amazing degree of ham- handedness in so sensitive a situation. To pay with the most precious of political currencies: electoral votes.

Russia's Choice Blames Yeltsin Aides for Dama ing Image

MK0[illegible]2091093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 86, 2 Dec 93 (Signed to press 1 Dec) p 1

[Report by Sergey Parkhomenko from the "Election Campaign" column: "Russia's Choice Is Concerned Over Actions by the Presidential Entourage"]

[Text] Fully reliable sources have told SEGODNYA's correspondent that the majority of Russia's Choice leaders

have reacted extremely painfully to the chain of scandals that have lately broken out against the backdrop of the election campaign.

Within the next few days the publication of a whole series of statements on behalf of Russia's Choice should be expected, devoted to, among other things, such farsighted and, most importantly, timely decisions by the presidential administration as the closure of the Central Lenin Museum or the confiscation of the Russian Press House to accommodate the future Federation Council. In the first instance the bloc is going to propose to the sides concerned to agree to a compromise in the shape of granting the Central Lenin Museum the status of a History Museum branch (retaining its former premises). In the latter, it must be stated quite candidly that the primitive superstition that forced officials in the presidential apparatus to refuse, following Boris Yeltsin himself, to use the White House according to its direct (or at least traditional) designation, will inevitably lead only to senseless conflicts and injure the bloc's reputation in the eyes of journalists and businessmen who will suffer direct material damage as a result of the legally leased premises being confiscated from them. At yesterday's conference in the former Parliament Center, Russia's Choice invited its opponents to sign a joint appeal to the president which cites Krasnopresnenskaya Naberezhnaya or the Kremlin as possible venues for the parliament.

Some members of the Russia's Choice executive committee are laying responsibility for creating these two incidents, really out of thin air, on Vladimir Shumeyko and Sergey Filatov, their "comrades in the bloc." "These two men have laid bare our whole flank for attack against all of us," said Garri Kasparov on Tuesday [30 November] in a conversation with journalists.

Yet Russia's Choice headquarters has reserved its strongest criticism for Vice Premier Shumeyko's recent letter to the Russian Federation Central Election Commission in which he demands that "the next session of the Central Election Commission consider all instances of canvassing against the draft constitution and withdraw registration as election associations from the Russian Federation Communist Party and the Democratic Party of Russia, which are openly calling for voting against the draft constitution as a whole...," and also mete out some sort of punishment for the same misdeeds to Yabloko [the Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin bloc], Civic Union, the Future of Russia, and the Agrarian Party.

Reports from Russia's Choice headquarters suggest that as 12 December draws near, the presence of a large number of highly placed figures from the federal administration among the bloc's leaders is beginning to be seen as a factor paradoxically inflicting telling damage on the bloc's election campaign. There is no way Russia's Choice can get away from its reputation as a direct representative of the Kremlin's and Staraya Ploshchad's interests in the ongoing election campaign. To count on real dividends from this—even insofar as regards the practical organization of the canvassing campaign—is becoming increasing difficult with every passing day.

Gaydar, Sobchak, Yavlinskiy on Election Show

LD0112235693

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Service in Russian at 1545 GMT on 1 December carries the "Federal Assembly-94" program, with the following introduction by Irina Lapina: "Hello. We continue to acquaint you with those who in the electoral campaign are fighting for our votes." The blocs presented, she goes on to say, are the same as in yesterday's program, but in reverse order. "Over, first, to the electoral association Russia's Choice."

The Russia's Choice contribution consists of a 20-minute film report entitled "Meeting with the Voters, House of Cinematographers, Moscow," in which Yegor Gaydar addresses an audience. He says that he and his colleagues realized from the outset that they were tackling a thankless task: "In a few months, one cannot put right the consequences of many decades. And, in general, it must be said that one can recall few examples in history of a finance minister being warmly thanked during his lifetime for conducting affairs well." It was, therefore, decided to pay little attention to praise or blame, but progress can be traced by seeing the changes in what the government was being criticized for.

In 1991, Gaydar says, the government was criticized most of all for the shortage of goods, for not introducing a state of emergency to cope with the situation, for the ruble's declining value against the dollar, and for the massive despatch of raw materials from the country. "In 1991, I selected the following criterion for myself, for example: I will regard the first stage of reform as being complete when people begin to fiercely criticize the government because of problems with selling home-produced goods and because they cannot withstand competition from foreign imports. At the last sitting of the government, which took place three weeks ago, the government came in for the fiercest criticism because we have enormous stocks of food. It is very hard to sell. Competition from imports gets in the way. High import barriers or quantitative restrictions on entry into our market must be introduced as a matter of urgency. People are beginning to criticize because—of course, goods had appeared; any fool can do that, that's clear—but now not everyone can buy them."

Gaydar says that the early stage of reform was relatively uncomplicated. "Now we are really coming up against the long-term and serious structural problems that afflict us and many of our fellows who are abandoning socialism—the legacy of that system."

He then lists some of these problems: "The first and most serious of them is, perhaps, the very expensive, very large, very inefficient state. There is a vast bureaucratic apparatus; the huge and inefficient structure of the economy, requiring constant drip feeds in the form of subsidies; an abundant military-industrial sector with which something has to be done; and the not always efficient, or simply inefficient, program of subsidies. All this imposes a huge burden on society, with which it is very hard to cope.

"And so we have a very dangerous, explosive mixture: A differentiation of income that has grown sharply, the impoverishment of the lowest strata of the middle class, an economy that is not growing, a brilliant, I would say, textbook basis for populist, nazi, fascist, or communist propaganda." He goes on to outline the obvious solutions to the problem: The bureaucracy must be trimmed, the state should withdraw from areas to which it is not well suited, subsidies must be pruned, and inefficient factories must be closed down. Progress has been made in these directions, he claims.

Asked about his differences with the Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin bloc, Gaydar says: "As for our differences with Grigoriy Alekseyevich [Yavlinskiy], if one is speaking about policy differences—I've just been interested to read the program of the economic Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin bloc, which appeared two or three days ago. There is a great deal there, and I totally agree with it, that is written in the program of Russia's Choice, word for word.

"There are some things there that I find somewhat surprising. For instance, it is proposed that export duties on machinery and equipment should be successively lowered. I was surprised by that, since I personally abolished them in toto on 2 January 1992. So I find it hard to understand how they are to be successively lowered."

Discussing his political opponents in general, Gaydar comments: "Recently, when I read the economic programs of many of our opponents, I felt as though I had eaten far too many Bounty bars—very sweet and very sickly."

Asked about Zhirinovskiy, Gaydar replies: "In my view, Zhirinovskiy has come on a lot recently. Three years ago, Zhirinovskiy reminded me mostly of Hitler as depicted in Soviet films, but he now reminds me of the real-life, 1929-model Hitler."

The Russia's Choice section is followed by an advertisement for the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms [RMDR]. This ushers in a conversation between artiste Oleg Gazmanov and St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak, both of whom are standing as RMDR candidates.

Sobchak begins by comparing Russia to a house in which everyone is used to living together. But Russia was isolated from the rest of the world for 75 years. The resulting backwardness must be overcome.

Gazmanov then says he is disturbed to notice that there are no longer any lines of people waiting to visit the Hermitage art gallery. He would be glad to see all the other lines, at food shops, for example, disappear, but he would want people to continue to need artistic sustinence.

Mayor Sobchak then talks about St. Petersburg's problems. Much maintenance work is needed on the fabric of the buildings. There are 1.5 million old people, all in need of social protection. The solutions will take a long time to find, but progress is under way. An attempt is being made to remove factories from the city center. Defense enterprises are being converted to civil production.

Gazmanov asks Sobchak whether St. Petersburg receives much money from the government. Sobchak replies that St. Petersburg is one of the few places that pay more into the exchequer than they get out of it, but it is impossible to finance all the changes that must be made, relying solely on the city's own resources.

Sobchak says that realistic promises must be made to people. The movement consists of well-known, self-made people such as Marshal Shaposhnikov, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Svyatoslav Fedorov, and Sobchak himself. He outlines his own humble origins. There will be a new constitution and a new parliament, which will frame new laws to make everyone's life easier. Russia has more vacant land than any other country. More of it needs to be given to people so that it could be used productively. Russia would not need to import grain if the people were enabled to grow it themselves. New laws are needed for this.

Irina Lapina then introduces an advertising clip for the Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin bloc. A voice-over gives a profile of Yavlinskiy's career over pictures of Moscow.

Grigoriy Yavlinskiy addresses the camera. The economy must develop before it can be controlled, he says. It must be a modern economy, with a large private sector, competition, and the private ownership of land. At present, there are too many monopolies. There is a lack of competition and that was why prices are high. The markets are controlled by cartels that turn away anyone who wants to sell his own produce at reasonable prices. Prices would never come down at that rate.

Yavlinskiy says that life is not just a matter of televised political debates. People must perceive the strategy behind reform, so that they could see that there is a point to all the hardship being caused: "Today the government is saying that the economy is getting better. I think that today among the viewers there are very few people who feel personally that the economy is getting better. Today prices are growing by 1 percent a day. I want to tell you that things can be done to see that prices grow by 1 percent a month. When will that happen? We think that it won't happen before another three years at the earliest. That's a long time. But if even that is to happen, we have to do a great deal."

Competition must be encouraged. Structural reorganization must be carried out. There is the problem of ownership: Who is responsible for a factory? Who is to put up the money for the factory's development? Very few people have used vouchers to become owners. They are more a populist solution to the problem of ownership than a real solution. The government must create competition. Privatization does not necessarily make a shop better. A shop still has a kind of monopoly because it is the only one of its kind in the area. When there are 10 or 100 such shops, real competition would begin, and prices would come down.

"Russia is a vast country," Yavlinskiy continues. "I don't think that anyone will ever again be able to start, or

end, reform from above, from Moscow. That is freedom—that people can do what they think is useful for themselves and interesting. This means that reform must come from below. This means that the interest of people living in a particular town and a particular region is the first interest for reform."

The regions must be given the freedom to choose their own path. Otherwise they would seek to obtain it covertly, and Russia would disintegrate.

Why are the economists not united, Yavlinskiy asks. Because they have different views on how to conduct the reforms and on what the priorities are. Yavlinskiy says that his bloc sees a need for state action before people are able to free themselves fully from its control in the economy. Inflation is a symptom of disease. The disease must be treated, not inflation directly. The bloc takes the view that the task of reform should be to free society from an economy that cannot feed its people or provide work. There is a long way to go before things improve.

Yavlinskiy says that members of the government should not be parliamentarians at the same time. He complains that it is unfair that some parties can draw on the government for help while others cannot. There is every reason to think that life in Russia will eventually improve—but not yet.

Shakhray, Others Air Electoral Platforms

LD0112215093

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel in Russian at 1645 GMT on 1 December features three election blocs in its "Voter's Hour" program: the Women of Russia Political Movement; the Party of Russian Unity and Accord; and the Agrarian Party of Russia.

The Party of Russian Unity and Accord devotes its slot to its leader Sergey Shakhray, centered on an interview filmed at his home with his family, interspersed with news clips of his official actvities. It started by recalling his two automobile accidents which, he said, had confirmed his faith in God. Later in the feature he was shown attending a religious ceremony in Novgorod. After clips of his family life, he also reaffirmed his belief in family values. "How can it be otherwise than family, spiritual values, property which you have earned with your own hands and one's homeland? I do not think that a Russian could have other values," Shakhray says.

He recalls the reasons why he left the government and says he returned to handle the Ossetian-Ingush crisis because it was near his home. He moved on to head the Committee for Nationalities Affairs where he enjoyed cooperation with the Supreme Soviet. "You may recall that I worked the whole time in very close contact with the Soviet of Nationalities. While the war was going on between the executive and legislative powers, I worked in harmony with the chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities because we always reckoned that no matter whether you are a communist or a democrat you must hand on to your descendants the Russian Federation whole, like a relay baton." However, the Ossetian-Ingush conlict is still explosive, he says.

Asked about the October events, Shakhray says: "The obvious advantages possessed by the presidential and governmental side and the calm in the regions seemed to make it inevitable that some compromise would be found and there would be a peaceful settlement of the conflict." Asked if he was certain that the president would prevail after violence had broken out, he replies: "I was not absolutely certain. The situation could have gone either way and I know that very well."

The interviewer asks Shakhray whether he has his own team. Shakhray replies: "This team exists in general outline; it is in the stage of being formed. The basis of this team arose when I resigned. By the next day many people had forgotten my existence, but some people did not forget; that was the first stage of forming the team. The second stage was my work in the zone of the Ossetian-Ingush conflict, in the hot spots. Many people had to prove themselves, and I became, for them, not someone in a jacket and tie, a bureaucrat and an official, but a normal Russian who knows what fear is and what responsibility is.

"I have always operated on the principle of releasing the military from political responsibility. I sign the political decision, I sign the order. The military should operate as professionals so that they are not hounded as they were in Tbilisi, Vilnius, and so on. That is the alpha and omega. And with this approach I gained many friends among the military, in the Defense Ministry, in the internal troops and among my colleagues in the Committee for Emergency Situations; Sergey Shoygu, for example, weWe had looked at each other previously but proceeded on parallel courses; Valeriy Shoykov; and, despite all our political disagreements, Aleksandr Kotenkov. The team is beginning to take shape."

Shakhray says he hopes to renew Russia in a human way. "I hope that the State Duma and I, personally, will be able to ensure a dialogue, to ensure accord which I see as the main thing now for Russia. Accord as a process. And for the state to provide the legislative basis for Russia's nationalities and regional policies." After the October events the party was hastily formed "as a political mechanism for seeking and finding accord between the regions and the state interests." He hopes that the opposing sides will be reconciled for the sake of Russia.

In the program's second slot, the Women of Russia Political Movement is represented by Alventina Fedulova and Yekaterina Lakhova, who are shown speaking in the studio. Fedulova begins by denying that Women of Russia supports corporatism and would act against the state's strategic interests. She says: "Women of Russia favors the economic reforms and new market relations. But we are also pro-life; we want to live today. We do not want to be buried under the debris of reforms." There must be priorities and these should be

agriculture, light industry, and the food industry. Municipal housing should be given free to those in need. In the budget, priority must be given to the social sector, particularly education and health.

Lakhova speaks of the unemployment problem. "Today, of those officially registered as unemployed in Russia—and they number about 700,000—over 70 percent are women. If one takes into account that there is hidden unemployment, and the number here is about 9 million—I mean those enterprises which send workers on indefinite unpaid leave or shorten the working day—women predominate among these, too." Women also suffer pay discrimination. Child care provision should be improved.

Fedulova rounds off by saying: "We will do everything to defend the interests of all social strata, both women and men. We will assess each law from the point of view of whether it is useful to people or not, whether it improves their lives or not."

In the program's third slot, the Agrarian Party of Russia is represented by M. Lapshin, A.D. Mikhaylov and I.P. Rybkin.

Lapshin begins by outlining the party's attitude to land ownership. Every citizen should receive a plot of land for personal use free of charge. As to agricultural land, "in our Russia all forms of ownership have the right to exist—state ownership, collective ownership and private ownership." This should be strictly regulated by law. "The main condition is that land should not be the object of speculation and it should not be the object for creating large estates. Land should not be taken out of agrcultural use." He goes on: "The main thing when drawing up land legislation, our party believes, is that land should always stay with the peasants. In all cases when it is transferred from one owner to another it must move from one peasant to another."

Mikhaylov says that collective farms are now in a weak state. When he entered a collective farm in the 1950's they were poor but they improved up to 1990. "Let us take acount from that year. The level of profitability in collective farms was 40 percent. Of the 26,000 collective farms, only 230 were unprofitable." In 1992 and 1993 they deteriorated rapidly. The main reason was that the state had not paid its debts to agricultural producers.

Mikhaylov continues: "Who is to blame? Of course, there are guilty persons. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for the five years of perestroyka made many promises but all his promises turned into their opposites. These positions and promises moved on to the government of Mr. Gaydar. Again there were great promises but during that government's time virtually nothing was achieved apart from collapse. They said there would be 100,000 private farmers in Russia at the start of 1992 and that these farmers would feed Russia. There are now, I venture to say, 260,000 of them and they produce only 1 percent of agricultural output. Mr. Chubays is implementing privatization. He is a monopolist in this matter. And what sort of privatization is it? Who can understand it?"

Rybkin touches on non-agricultural matters. "Extremism is always very one-sided. As a political electoral association, we feel this particularly and avoid it. This is particularly so in our electoral program. We totally reject extremism in the question of statehood and in tackling the nationalities question. We have already heard from this hall statements about Russia's borders, particularly the southern ones, that we should turn off the oil and gas and bring others to their knees. These approaches are totally alien to us. To put it bluntly, this is political madness. We call for the restoration of the economic alliance of the friendly peoples who lived on the territory of the former Soviet Union, on a mutually- advantageous, respectful, totally voluntary basis. There should be no sabre-rattling or verbal thundering here."

Lapshin concludes by promising that the Agrarian Party will "defend the interests of rural inhabitants, the inhabitnts of large and small towns, and everyone employed in the agro-industrial complex."

Yavlinskiy Will Not Form Alliance With Communists

LD0112145893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1131 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Grigoriy Yavlinskiy has declared that if nothing extraordinary happens then his bloc will receive 15-20% of votes at the elections scheduled for December 12. Addressing a press conference on Wednesday in Yekaterinburg, he pointed out that in the future parliament the Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin bloc would become "a democratic opposition within a democratic wing."

Yavlinskiy underlined that he would not form a bloc with Gennadiy Zyuganov's Communist Party, Agrarian Party or the Liberal-Democratic Party of Vladimir Zhirinovskiy under any circumstances.

At the same time Yavlinskiy emphasized that he would cooperate with Gaydar if the latter recognized his mistakes and discussed his economic program constructively.

Regarding the draft Constitution, Yavlinskiy underlined that the Basic Law should be adopted as soon as possible. In his words, the procedure of the Constitution's adoption, which could break the country into two camps of its opponents and supporters aroused some concern.

Responding to INTERFAX, Yavlinskiy declared that he was in favor of a treaty but not constitutional federation.

PRUA Leaders Outline Election Programs

LD0112211693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2019 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—The Party of Russian Unity and Accord (PRUA) continues to outline its programme in the run up to parliamentary elections. Aleksandr Kotyonkov, member of the PRUA Federal Council and head of the Department for Legal Issues and Affairs of the State under the Russian President, declared today that it was necessary to develop a concept of the system of national security.

The PRUA believes that an instable political situation in Russia poses the main threat to security. Kotyonkov suggested that the Federal Assembly adopt a concept of the system of security and bring Russia's military doctrine in line with the concept.

The PRUA leader and Vice-Premier Sergey Shakhray who arrived in the city of Perm on Wednesday continues meetings with electors. Outlining the programme of his party, Shakhray pointed out that in his opinion, a draft constitution suggested in July, 1993 envisaged a better balance between the parliamentary and presidential branches of power.

While in Perm, Shakhray addressed workers of the "Perm Motors" joint stock society, directors' and administrative corps, representatives of public and political movements, journalists and attended a presentation ceremony of the PRUA department in Perm.

Election Commission Refuses To Ban Parties

LD0212103993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0847 GMT 2 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS—The Central Electoral Commission turned down a government request on Thursday [2 December] to bar two political parties from the upcoming elections for their harsh criticism of the draft constitution.

The electoral commission has thus confirmed the Wednesday statement of the Information Arbitration Court which said candidates are free to criticise the draft, but should do that in a polite form.

The request was filed by First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shumeyko who said that the Communist Party and the Democratic Party of Russia should be barred from elections to the Federal Assembly because they had sharply criticised the draft constitution which establishes the new parliament and according to which future lawmakers will have to work.

The commission recalled that the provisions on a nationwide referendum which is to vote on the new constitution grant the Russian citizens the right to freely speak both in favour and against the new basic law. However, any criticisms or propaganda are banned the day before the referendum and during it.

Poll Shows 'Russia's Choice' Leads

PM0212101993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 4

[Report by Aleksey Levinson of the All-Russia Center for the Study of Public Opinion on Social and Economic Questions: "Who Supports 'Russia's Choice'?"]

[Text] A poll of 1,086 townspeople 22 November showed what kind of people intend to vote for "Russia's Choice." Around 50 percent of the committed "Russia's Choice" urban electorate is made up of workers, employees, and specialists. Around 24 percent, just below the sample average, are pensioners. The number of servicemen, students, and entrepreneurs is somewhat above average.

Election studies by the All-Russia Center for the Study of Public Opinion on Social and Economic Questions, as IZVESTIYA has already reported, have shown that a number of the rival parties have developed their own social base, their own committed electorate. For instance, the older the respondents, the more actively they intend to vote for the Communist Party of the Russian Federation [CPRF], while the lower their educational level, the more often respondents want to vote for the Liberal Democratic Party. The opposite trends are true of the more numerous democratic voters—the higher their social activeness (associated with both a certain age and education), the higher their support for parties and blocs like "Russia's Choice," the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms, the Party of Russian Unity and Accord, and Yavlinskiy's bloc.

The "Russia's Choice" bloc is the largest in terms of support among Russian citizens. When asked "Which parties or blocs would you like to see in the Russian parliament? (give no more than five parties)" a representative sample of 1,655 residents of Russian cities and villages polled in mid-November cited "Russia's Choice" most frequently (29 percent of respondents). When only one party was chosen, as in the real ballot, this bloc took first place with twice as many votes as the second most popular—the Yavlinskiy bloc.

Meanwhile politicians from some of the parties appealing to democratically-minded voters have tried to base their campaign largely on criticism of "Choice" and its leaders, obviously in the hope of winning over a section of its electorate. However, they failed to consider the fact that "Choice" has relatively more appeal to their own supporters than vice versa. Thus, 40 percent of Democratic Party of Russia [DPR] urban supporters sympathize with "Choice," whereas only half that number of "Choice" supporters lean toward the DPR.

In the country's cities 23 percent of "Choice" supporters voiced confidence in Shakhray and the same percentage in Yavlinskiy, 16 percent went for Sobchak, and 18 percent expressed confidence in Chernomyrdin.

Among supporters of all blocs the "Choice" electorate is noted for the highest level of confidence in Gaydar and Yeltsin: Around 65 percent of this bloc's sympathizers say that they trust its leader and over 60 percent of them also have confidence in the president.

However, it is not sympathies for individuals that are the greatest unifying force among "Choice" supporters but their commitment to the reformist course. For comparison's sake: 14 percent of townspeople who champion the CPRF advocate the continuation of economic reforms, whereas the number of people in favor of suspending reform is higher by a factor of four (58 percent). Some 53 percent of those who support the Yavlinskiy bloc in the cities are in favor of reforms, while a third of that number (18 percent) are in

favor of suspending them. But virtually all urban "Russia's Choice" supporters (87 percent) are in favor of continuing reforms, while only a twelfth of that number—7 percent—are opposed to doing so.

Commission Meeting Studies Issues for 12 Dec

LD0112183793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1715 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS—The Governmental Commission for Ensuring the December 12 Constitutional Referendum went today into a second meeting chaired by Russian Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shumeyko, a government spokesman reported. The meeting was attended by Deputy Chairman of the Central Election Commission Aleksandr Ivanchenko.

Participants in the meeting tackled a set of issues concerning the material and technical support and financing of the vote in military units and remote regions. Also discussed were problems of keeping law and order in the run-up to the referendum.

Speakers noted that the measures outlined at the previous meeting with an aim to bring the draft constitution home to Russian residents had got under way. Major newspapers were recommended to print the lengthy document once again.

The commission instructed the relevant organizations to urgently pay the delayed upkeep and other social allowances to servicemen and other citizens engaged in the budget-subsidized sphere.

The next meeting of the commission is scheduled for December 3.

Paper Denies Involvement in Telephone Poll on Election

PM0212092793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 93 First Edition p 6

[IZVESTIYA response from the "Questions for the Newspaper" column: "IZVESTIYA Did Not Carry Out Poll"]

[Text] Several of our readers have informed the editorial office that someone using IZVESTIYA's name is carrying out a telephone poll. The questions being asked concern the upcoming elections. The questioners refused to give their names.

We hereby announce that IZVESTIYA is not carrying out any poll on the elections or on any other subjects. We have not asked any organization or private persons to question Muscovites on their home telephone numbers.

Tribunal Resolves Election Registration Disputes

PM0112160793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 2

[Report by Robert Minasov: "Overstepping the Mark. Arbitration Tribunal Deliberates"]

[Text] Instances of the use of covert political advertising in the electronic mass media have appeared during the election campaign, which is a violation of legislative requirements. This conclusion was reached at an arbitration tribunal session. Thus, in a 14 November radio interview with Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin the moderator had asked questions about the attitude of the "Party of Russian Unity and Accord" election association, from which Shokhin has been nominated as a candidate for deputy, toward the "Russia's Choice" election association. The vice premier was thereby given the opportunity to politically advertise his election association and to make critical comments about his rivals, and he took advantage of it. The ethical and legal complaints relate primarily to the program's moderator.

It is known that a number of journalists have secured nomination as candidates. A gratifying fact. At the same time the Information Arbitration Tribunal notes that it does not know of any journalists who are candidates, apart from K. Ignatyev, that have fulfilled the requirements of Article 23 of the Statute on Information Guarantees and official announced that they are suspending their participation in the preparation of television and radio programs.

The Information Arbitration Tribunal considered complaints from A. Yurkus and A. Pashchenko, candidates for the Russian Federation Federal Assembly State Duma from the "Russia's Choice" election association for Kirov Oblast, who were denied the right to free appearances on state regional television and radio.

The Information Arbitration Tribunal considers this case a gross violation of the requirements of the statute on the election of deputies to the State Duma. It recommended that the "Vyatka" state television and radio broadcasting company ensure that candidates Yurkus and Pashchenko can exercise their right to appear on television and radio.

There is a whiff of scandal about the registration of V. Dyakonov, candidate for the Federal Assembly Federation Council from Krasnodar's No. 23 Electoral District.

The tribunal established that Dyakonov had been registered as a candidate by a 20 November decision of the No. 23 District Electoral Commission.

During a 22 November interview on Ostankino's "Utro" television program A. Runov, Krasnodar Kray administration representative to the Russian Federation Government, stated that Dyakonov's registration had been canceled because he had falsified a vast number of signatures.

During a session on the same day the district electoral commission rescinded its previous decision on Dyakonov's registration.

On 29 November the Central Electoral Commission revoked the No. 23 District Electoral Commission decision to refuse to register Dyakonov as a candidate for deputy, and his rights as a candidate for the Federal Assembly were restored.

Amendments to Lists of Registered Election Candidates

PM0112141793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the Central Electoral Commission"]

[Text] The Russian Federation Central Electoral Commission has announced that:

In accordance with Article 25 of the "Statute on the Election of State Duma Deputies in 1993," Aleksandr Vladimirovich Ponomarev is excluded from the federal list of State Duma candidate deputies from the "Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin Bloc" electoral association on the basis of his personal statement of 11 November 1993 and decree No. 11 issued by the "Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin Bloc" electoral association council 21 November 1993.

The following additions have been made to the list of registered Russian Federation Federal Assembly Federation Council candidate deputies (ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, 27 November 1993):

Krasnodarskiy No. 23

Vasiliy Nikolayevich Dyakonov. Born 1946, vice president of the Russian "Montazhspetsstroy" Corporation.

Saratovskiy No. 64

Valeriy Nikolayevich Davydov. Born 1940, chairman of the "VNIPI-Inform Butek" council of directors.

Ust-Ordynskiy Buryatskiy No. 85

Aleksey Nikolayevich Batagayev. Born 1950, head of the Ust-Orda Buryat Autonomous Okrug Administration.

For technical reasons errors were included in the list of Federal Assembly State Duma candidate deputies (ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, 30 November 1993):

Included in Kirovskiy District No. 93 (Kirov Oblast) [subhead]

Vladimir Anatolyevich Shalayev. Born 1948, chief of the northern electrical networks' switching facilities service at the "Kirovenergo" joint-stock company; not running in Novokuznetskiy District No. 91, Kemerovo Oblast.

Yegor Ilich Savin. Born 1939, director of the Kotelnich Sewn Goods Factory; not running in Prokopyevskiy District No. 92, Kemerovo Oblast.

Viktor Alekseyevich Slobodchikov. Born 1947, director of the Verkhnekamskiy Phosphorus Mine; not running in Prokopyevskiy District No. 92, Kemerovo Oblast.

Marat Osherovich Frenkel. Born 1939, chief of the Center for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Monitoring; not running in Prokopyevskiy District No. 92, Kemerovo Oblast.

Nikolay Andreyevich Savin. Born 1946, deputy head of the Kirov Oblast Administration; not running in Kirovskiy District No. 189, Yaroslavl Oblast.

Media Issues

Journalist Rails Against 'Excommunication' of Media

OW0212095993 Moscow Russian Television and Dubl Networks in Russian 0500 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Commentary by V. Voropayev; from the "Dalniy Vostok" program]

[Text] It appears that preparations for the election of a new parliament, the main event in the life of Russia, will never become the main topic of news and promotional television programs. Through long-winded and artful decisions journalists, in essence, have been excommunicated from the pre-election campaign. Out of consideration for neutrality and equal opportunity for candidates, we are directed not to get involved in pre-election campaigning with our biased commentaries and one-sided propaganda. That is how all journalists—in one fell swoop and in advance—are accused of bias and this has essentially not only brought about substantial limitations in the professional field, but has deprived us of the main right and the main responsibility of expressing the interests of those millions of people who at different times are called differently—voters, citizens, inhabitants, people, and television viewers.

The inhabitants are directed to listen to televised monologues from seekers of parliamentary seats, and state television and radio company journalists are ordered only to provide equal opportunity for the candidates' self-expression. In practice, this forced noninvolvement means nothing less than a betrayal of viewers' and, therefore, voters interests. So, on par with such a situation in guaranteeing news about the pre-election campaign, there is a corresponding result; in the past week there has been an increase in the number of people who doubt that it is necessary to participate. Quite likely the underscored indifference of state television, to a great degree, has further contributed to this situation.

Press Ministry Blamed for Letting DEN Reemerge

MK0112143093 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No.49, 5 Dec 93 (Signed to press 30 Nov) p A3

[Report by Dmitriy Pushkar under the "Opposition" rubric: "Call It a DAY" ("DEN")]

[Text] The Press Ministry, which has decisively and definitively closed fascist publications without recourse to court, has been legalizing them under new names.

The coup plotters of yesterday have finally left the underground and acquired an absolutely legal press organ. Initially there was the newspaper SOGLASIYE [ACCORD], which sprung from DEN (one issue was printed illegally at a state-owned printing house in Lipetsk with false data about the publisher, see MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No. 47). Now there is ZAVTRA [TOMORROW], a newspaper officially registered with the Press Ministry. They told your MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI correspondent at the Press Ministry that the newspaper was registered by Mr. A. Khudorozhko, permanently residing in the Russian Federation, who paid a registration fee and submitted the publication's prospectus. Meanwhile, the publishing information says in black and white: publisher—the "DEN Editorial Board" limited company. They think at the Press Ministry that this gives grounds only to impose a fine on the newspaper, but that it can be closed only by court ruling... So the revamped DEN is issued in its usual 60,000-copy print run. Its course—toward confrontation—has remained unchanged, as has its captain, Aleksandr Prokhanov. Chief editors were introduced in an unorthodox way. The front page features an old photo of the top brass of the 1940's: Stalin, Beriya... An inscription under the photo says: "Editorial Board of the DEN newspaper."

Headings are done in the old format, old rubrics remain in place. An unidentified hit man gives his account of how he fled OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] members: "Two horns tied together have been emptied. I took out the third, hidden one. I showed them that I can. I aimed well, under a helmet's brim... Forgive me, brother—I have forgiven you." This cynical gibberish in front of coffins does not square with facts—only one OMON member was killed, and not outside Hammer's International Trade Center, as the hit man claims. Maybe he killed young soldiers from the Dzerzhinskiy Division? By the way, as for lying: That same man claims to have seen a man next to him vanish into the air after explosions of tank shells. He himself, however, managed to avoid any injuries whatsoever.

The issue demonstrates for the first time a split of an entrenched personality: two congratulations to a foreign magazine on its 50th anniversary are signed separately by two editorial boards—DEN's and ZAVTRA's. Since Aleksandr Prokhanov explains on the front page that this is one and the same thing, would it not have been easier to put a comma between the signatures?

Trial Issue of 'First Russian Tabloid' Published

PM0112102393 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 93 p 8

[Report by Gavrila Semeykin: "Newspaper Rushes at 'Express' Speed"]

[Text] A trial issue of EKSPRESS GAZETA—the first Russian tabloid, as the title page says—has been published. Vladimir Snegirev, general director of EKSPRESS GAZETA:

""EKSPRESS' will in the future become Russia's best mass newspaper—a vivid, small-format newspaper with crosswords and a horoscope. It will have sport, crime news, erotica, and super-investigations by journalists. And most important—no politics!"

Aleksandr Kupriyanov, chief editor of EKSPRESS GAZETA:

"EKSPRESS GAZETA is to a certain degree a counterpart to THE DAILY MIRROR, one of the most mass-based British newspapers."

As they say, well we shall wait and see... It is worth adding that both these gentlemen come from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. Nonetheless the list of subjects in the trial issue is impressive: They have discovered a close friend of Yuriy Gagarin and her diaries; there is Khasbulatov's last letter from the "White House" to the outside world; there is a confession from a man who mined a nuclear power station.

And a great deal more sensational and, frankly, scandalous information.

Economic Issues

Yeltsin Issues Edict on Foreign Banks' Activities

PM0112135793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 4

[Edict No. 1924 of the Russian Federation President "On the Activities of Foreign Banks and Joint Banks Involving the Funds of Nonresidents on the Territory of the Russian Federation"; signed by President B. Yeltsin in the Kremlin on 17 November]

[Text] In order to further develop and strengthen the Russian Federation banking system, and provide effective state monetary and credit regulation, on the basis of points 2 and 3 of 7 October 1993 edict No. 1598 of the Russian Federation president "On legal regulation during the stage-by-stage constitutional reform in the Russian Federation," I rule that:

1. It is to be laid down that the list of transactions carried out on the basis of Russian Federation Central Bank licenses by foreign banks and their branches and also by joint banks, in which nonresidents' share of the capital exceeds 50 percent, which failed to start providing services for Russian Federation residents by 15 November 1993 and also obtained licenses after the aforesaid date, will be temporarily confined, until 1 January 1996, to transactions with corporate bodies and individuals who are nonresidents of the Russian Federation.

2. The Russian Federation Central Bank is to present to the Russian Federation president in the first half of 1994, for future examination by the Russian Federation Federal Assembly proposals on making changes to the

RSFSR Law "On Banks and Banking Activity in the RSFSR" which will provide for the use of the financial resources of banks and other credit institutions to solve priority tasks of the development of the Russian economy and protect the national banking system.

3. The present edict is to be submitted to the Russian Federation Federal Assembly for its examination.

4. The present edict comes into effect the moment it is published.

[Signed] Russian Federation President B. Yeltsin
[Dated] 17 November 1993, the Kremlin, Moscow

Edict on Credit, Debt Reschedules With Ex-USSR Nations

PM0112143193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 4

[Edict No. 1934 of the Russian Federation president "On the Ratification of Russian Federation Intergovernmental Agreements With States That Are Former Republics of the USSR"; signed by President B. Yeltin in Kremlin on 18 November—followed by a list of intergovernmental agreements]

[Text] In order to ensure the ongoing regulation of economic processes in the country connected with foreign economic activity and financal and economic links with states that are former republics of the USSR, and on the basis of Edict No. 1598 of the Russian Federation president of 7 October 1993 "On Legal Regulation During Stage-by-Stage Constitutional Reform in the Russian Federation," I decree that:

1. Russian Federation intergovernmental agreements with states that are former republics of the USSR, listed below, are to be ratified.

The Russian Federation foreign minister is to notify interested parties of the Russian side's implementation of the intrastate procedure necessary for the aforementioned agreements' entry into effect.

2. The present edict is to be submitted to the Russian Federation Federal Assembly for its examination.

3. The present edict enters into effect the moment it is signed.

[Signed] Russian Federation President B. Yeltsin.

[Dated] The Kremlin, Moscow, 18 November 1993.

List of Russian Federation Intergovernmental Agreements with States That Are Former Republics of the USSR, Ratified by the Russian Federation President

1. Agreement between the Russian Federation Government and Government of the Republic of Georgia on state credit in 1993, signed in Moscow on 15 September 1993.

2. Agreement between the Russian Federation Government and Government of the Republic of Georgia on redesignating the industrial credits debt at the end of 1992 as state credit to the Government of the Republic of Georgia, signed in Moscow on 15 September 1993.

3. Agreement between the Russian Federation Government and Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan on state credit in 1993, signed in Moscow on 29 July 1993.

4. Agreement between the Russian Federation Government and Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan on redesignating the industrial credits debt at the end of 1992 as January-June 1993 state credit to the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, signed in Moscow on 29 July 1993.

5. Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and Government of the Kyrgyz Republic on state credit in 1993, signed in Moscow on 27 July 1993.

6. Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and Government of the Republic of Moldova on state credit in 1993, signed in Sochi on 27 May 1993.

7. Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and Government of the Republic of Tajikistan on state credit in 1993, signed in Moscow on 20 July 1993.

8. Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and Government of the Republic of Tajikistan on redesignating the industrial credits debt for January-June 1992 as January-June 1993 state credit to the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan, signed in Moscow on 20 July 1993.

Gaydar Answers Phone-In Questions on Economy

PM0112145193 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 93 p 3

[Report on phone-in with First Deputy Prime Minister Yegor Gaydar by Yevgeniy Anisimov, Yelena Arakelyan, Sergey Razin, Irina Savvateyeva, and Fedor Sizyy under the "Direct Line" rubric; date not given: "Today in Russia It Is a Sin Not To Earn...."]

[Text] [Vyacheslav, caller] My name is Vyacheslav, I am unemployed.

It seems to me that the Council of Ministers is currently overstaffed. If you recall, in 1992 there were three vice premiers, and now there are ten of them!

[Gaydar] I cannot agree with you. This is a very tricky problem for me. Indeed, in 1991, when we reorganized the government, we attempted to establish it in accordance with the normal standards of the market economy—we tried to make it very small and compact. We had a total of 23 cabinet members and three vice premiers. Unfortunately, experience shows that the bureaucracy manages to repulse such cavalier attacks fairly quickly. Considerable pressure was immediately applied: First one organ is established, then another, and then a third....

I think that after the elections we will have an opportunity to tackle fairly earnestly the reorganization of the state apparatus, primarily to make substantial cuts and ax a number of ministries and departments.

[Second caller] Yegor Timurovich, there are rumors that investors in commercial banks will be taxed....

[Gaydar] Proposals to this effect were drawn up in the apparatus, but we have not supported them.

[Third caller] I myself am an inhabitant of Kazakhstan, from Almaty. At the present time I am living in Moscow illegally, shall we say. I would like to know whether the decree promulgated by Mayor Luzhkov regarding payment for living in Moscow is lawful. Does it not constitute a human rights violation? If it does, why is the government not getting involved?

[Gaydar] I must say that I am far from happy about a number of things in this decree which seem to me unbalanced, unreasonable, or at variance with the relevant principles of human rights. The government is examining this issue at the present time.

[Alekseyev, caller] This is Alekseyev from Moscow calling. If "Russia's choice" wins the election, in accordance with generally accepted political practice you will form the new government and become premier. What do you feel about this situation?

[Gaydar] Right now the issue is about elections to the State Duma and the Federal Assembly, not the formation of a government. The main purpose of the election is to form a responsible parliament which can engage sensibly in lawmaking activity and formulate budget policy.

As far as personal and personnel changes in the government are concerned, first of all, this is the president's prerogative—in accordance with the draft of the Constitution which, I hope, will actually be supported. And second, right now I would think it necessary to be guided not by personal ambitions but primarily by the need to preserve stability and the continuity of power in Russia.

[Fifth caller] Hello, I'm calling from Belarus. We have spoken a lot about economic union. And now Russia has announced that it can do without parasites. Kazakhstan has been rebuffed. So has Uzbekistan. Belarus is being pushed away. How are we to understand this?

[Gaydar] Of course Russia needs economic ties with former Union republics. These ties are advantageous for Russia itself and needless to say we will maintain them.

It is quite another matter that these ties should be mutually advantageous. Russia is currently not the richest of countries, and it can scarcely afford to break records in respect of the volume of aid granted to foreign states. In 1992 I was reproached for the unprecedented scale of aid granted to former Union republics. At the time we were acting correctly, because it was impossible to change flows of goods and resources that had been established over decades. But we had to divert these relations into a normal civilized channel—which is what we are doing. Into export credits, for example, not just cash handouts.

[Sixth Caller] Hello, is that "Direct Line?" I'm calling from Kalmykia. I would like to know your opinion of Kalmyk President Kirsan Nikolayevich.

[Gaydar] My opinion of your president is the same as my opinion of any president of an autonomous republic—one of respect.

[Sixth Caller] What about his actions of 3-4 October?

[Gaydar] I do not think that everything he did 3 and 4 October was entirely reasonable.

[Sixth Caller] Yegor Timurovich, one more question. At the present time many people here are on a salary of 20,000 rubles. But coal costs 150,000. How can this be?

[Gaydar] You need to earn more.

[Sixth Caller] But how are pensioners to do that? My sister's pension, for example, comes to 20,000....

[Gaydar] Do you help her out?

[Sixth Caller] I myself find it difficult to make ends meet.

[Gaydar] You know, a colossal number of people are traveling to Russia from former Union republics; they want just one thing—the opportunity to earn money in Russia. Because they can earn far more in our country than at home.

Without any doubt, it is currently possible to earn money in Russia. I think that able-bodied men ought not to complain. Those who cannot work have very serious problems, of course. I agree with you. They need to be helped, it is they who need to be protected most of all. Even now we are trying to increase pensions faster than the minimum wage.

This is a difficult problem which can only be solved in one way: We all need to gradually earn more in order to provide these people with bigger pensions.

[Sharova, caller] Hello. My name is Margarita Sergeyevna Sharova. I was born in 1921, I am a rehabilitated pensioner with a category-II disability. Is your government thinking of paying back its debts to pensioners? Our savings are recorded in booklets—and these have become worthless....

[Gaydar] I honestly have to say that there is no simple solution to this problem. At the end of the 1980's investors' money was entirely drawn into servicing the needs of the state. First and foremost this money went on financing defense expenditure. The money simply does not exist, and therefore it is impossible to give back. Germany, for example, was only able to give back frozen money 10 years later. Maybe we too will be able to give back this money after 10 years if our economy really does start to operate properly.

[Eighth Caller] Hello, Yegor Timurovich. This is Leonid Alekseyenko in Yekaterinburg. I have two daughters aged 13 and 10. They are asking me: When will be able to live better?

[Gaydar] In some respects we are already living better. You do not have to stand for two hours in line, today you do not have to humiliate yourself in front of the shop assistant, and you do not have to fly to Moscow to buy sausage. You do not have any problems regarding the fact that you can't obtain anything. The ruble is now convertible.

Of course, this is still not very much. But we have made some progress, and our income will gradually increase. It will take some time, however, for every family to have everything it needs. I believe that progress in this direction could start as early as 1994-1995. How much do you earn at present?

[Eighth Caller] A total of 80,000 rubles altogether.

[Gaydar] That is not very much, without any doubt. But what did you earn in December 1991?

[Eighth Caller] About 530 rubles, I think.

[Gaydar] If your pay at that time had been expressed in terms of the world market, it would have been $3. Now it is $73. This still is not very much. In Poland, for example, people earn $150. In order for us to start earning $150, we will need two years, provided we do not do anything dumb. And we will need another five years to start earning an average of $250-300. Then we can move little by little to the sort of living standards which prosperous countries currently enjoy.

On the whole, however, I am convinced that within the life span of a single generation we can raise Russia to a very decent standard of living.

[Ninth Caller] Hello, Yegor Timurovich. This is Andrey Nishtokin, correspondent of the "Eighth Day" program in Kursk, calling. Why is your foreign currency account abroad when you could invest these savings in our Kursk Bank?

[Gaydar] I do not have a foreign currency account abroad.

[10th Caller] This is Lyubov Vasilyevna Yanayeva, a northerner, speaking. Do you have an opinion about the depressed regions, in particular the regions of the North, Siberia, and the Far East. Will the government help us in some way?

[Gaydar] The government is not standing idly by. We have the "Resettlement" program focusing an enormous amount of attention on the coal regions. As far as the North is concerned, the state is financing programs formulated by the State Committee for the Social and Economic Development of the North.

[11th Caller] Hello there, Yegor Timurovich. I am a teacher at a higher educational institution. I earn 30,000 rubles. But it is simply impossible to live on this amount!

[Gaydar] The higher education issue has been looked at. But it would be irresponsible on my part to promise you that from tomorrow we will increase qualified teachers' pay in line with reasonable norms.

From next year we would prefer to switch to a new system of financing higher education. Money will be allocated for training specialists under a specific state order.

[11th Caller] But we need to be able to live somehow. This is just poverty: Today we got paid—9,029 rubles. That means just one shopping trip!

[Gaydar] I am well aware of this. But unfortunately the state itself is bankrupt. We will certainly look for ways to maintain Russia's intellectual potential. This I can certainly promise you.

[12th Caller] Yegor Timurovich, I'm calling from Ufa. My surname is Nailin. When will businessmen handle goods production more profitably rather than simply reselling?

[Gaydar] Quite bluntly, I will say to you: When we are able to knock down the monthly inflation rate from the present 20 percent to 3-5 percent a month. With inflation at 20 percent a month the discount rate and refinancing rate make any production activity extremely problematical and investment impossible.

[13th caller] Yegor Timurovich, this is Sergey Valeryevich Seregin speaking. I am an entrepreneur. Here is my question. What indicators is the government intending to use in January next year? And in the medium term—over the next two to three years.

[Gaydar] We believe that by January we will be able to make a major dent in inflation and bring the rate down to a maximum of 15 percent a month. We are hoping that during 1994 we will be able to establish a low-inflation economy and by the end of the year achieve an inflation index of no more than 3-5 percent a month.

We believe that the rate of decline of production will slow down substantially next year, to between 6 and 8 percent, and in 1995 we intend to stabilize the volume of production; 1996 will see the start of an increase in production. The dollar exchange rate, it is proposed, will fall much more slowly than the rate of inflation, while the growth in the real ruble exchange rate vis-a-vis the dollar will continue accordingly, albeit not very quickly. At the present time our plan is for the dollar exchange rate to grow half as slowly as monthly inflation.

Last month it was very difficult for us maintain the dollar exchange rate to ensure that it did not start to decline rapidly, which was the last thing we wanted to see. Right now it is moving in the approximate direction we want it to go in. This is very much the dynamic we propose to establish in the coming months.

[14th Caller] Yegor Timurovich, do you support what Gerashchenko is doing as head of the Central Bank?

[Gaydar] I have a fairly large number of complaints about the Central Bank's policy at the end of 1992 and the beginning of 1993. I think that in a number of areas this policy was wrong, and that we were unable to regulate our relations with the Commonwealth states for a very long time.

Nevertheless I ought to say that since April, following the referendum, the Central Bank has on the whole stuck to the guidelines which the government has formulated.

[14th Caller] But will you actually remove Gerashchenko at the present time? What is stopping you? The Supreme Soviet no longer exists. And I do not think Chernomyrdin supports him.

[Gaydar] This issue will be discussed with the president and the Federal Assembly. Under the new Constitution, the Central Bank chairman will be appointed by the president and must be approved by the Federal Assembly. I think that when this issue is resolved, all the factors relating to the Central Bank's work will be taken into account.

[Tokamobidze, caller] My name is Gerasiy Yuryevich Tokamobidze. I would like to ask about the government's recent decree on export quotas. Is there anything new in it regarding the export of strategic goods—oil and oil products?

[Gaydar] The issue is not actually about oil products—the situation regarding these products remains the same—but about the sharp reduction in the number of products on which quotas are imposed. Whereas we used to impose quotas on practically everything, from meat to timber, the list is now extremely short: oil, oil products, gas, electricity, certain types of nonferrous metals, durum and soft wheat, sunflower seeds, and fish. The vast majority of agricultural products, mineral fertilizers, and timber can now be exported without any problem whatsoever. Incidentally, this has already created preconditions for our agricultural producers to break into the world market—with goods which are clearly surplus on our internal market.

[Tokamobidze] I see. But could you please clarify: Who actually decides—a commission of the Council of Ministers or a commission of the Ministry of Economics?

[Gaydar] Material relating to quotas or licenses is still drawn up by the Ministry of Economics, but a final decision on this issue is made by the government's Commission on Operational Questions headed by Oleg Nikolayevich Soskovets; I too am a member of this commission.

[Sanagorskiy, caller] Hello, this is Aleksandr Viktorovich Sanagorskiy from Moscow speaking. Yegor Timurovich, what is your opinion of the strike by miners in Vorkuta?

[Gaydar] I am very alarmed by the situation that has developed there. Of course, in many ways it is a reflection of the problems in the national economy as a whole. But this strike is also a reaction to the feebleness of our strategy regarding everything that concerns the coal-mining sector and the prospects for the region.

I think that this is where the government should now concentrate its attention. And I will try to address this issue.

[Besedin, caller] Yegor Timurovich, this is Aleksandr Borisovich Besedin, an engineer from Moscow. I would like to know your opinion about the efficiency of private farms compared, for example, to the kolkhoz-sovkhoz system.

It is well known that a private farmer works from dawn to dusk, but a person cannot work like this for many years. In the previous system we had division of labor.

[Gaydar] There is no doubt that division of labor exists in the same way as division of a lack of responsibility. We know how traditionally low the efficiency of collective agriculture is.

In our country the private farming sector is something new; it is still in the formative stage, and it is still rather weak. But I think that this sector, together with transformed kolkhozes and sovkhozes, their gradual transformation into cooperatives, and an increase in the number of personal plots, is the trend that will inevitably increase the efficiency of our agriculture.

I am a believer in cooperative agriculture....

[Razin, caller] Yegor Timurovich, this is Sergey Razin from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. I have a few short questions. An announcement was made recently that living standards have suddenly shot up by 13 percent.

[Gaydar] In conditions of high inflation, any data on living standards has some significance when we clearly define what periods we are comparing. If you take December 1992 as a basis for your calculations, you will see that living standards dipped very slightly. If you take January 1993, living standards rose.

But expressed in dollar terms, of course, against the background of the gradual strengthening of the ruble exchange rate in relation to the dollar there has been a consistent increase in average dollar pay from approximately $30, the starting point at the end of 1992, to the current figure of $75.

[Razin] My second question. Is "AvtoVAZ" making a mistake by raising its prices above world levels?

[Gaydar] I think it is a risky policy. But this is the enterprise's policy. And as vice premier I do not wish to dictate any decisions of my own.

[Razin] There was a report recently that on the night of 4 October the Ministry of Finance demanded 1 billion rubles in cash from the Central Bank, which was spent on "giving a warm welcome" to the people who turned up at Moscow City Soviet on your bidding....

[Gaydar] Some day I will relate at length and in detail what happened during the night of 3-4 October. The

Ministry of Finance did indeed demand 1 billion in cash from the Central Bank, but the money was issued by commercial banks, not the Central Bank. And this money was returned the very next day once the situation had been clarified and stabilized.

[Razin] Yegor Timurovich, may I ask you a personal question. Have you yourself ever experienced any financial difficulties, and how were you able to extricate yourself from them?

[Gaydar] I experienced personal financial hardship around the end of the 1980's when my earnings were rigidly fixed by a pay scale, that is to say a scale appropriate to my main place of work. Like a lot of my compatriots, after I got the opportunity to earn a little extra money by giving lectures, writing articles, and basically taking stock of my modest material needs, I was able to resolve my main problems.

I began to experience material difficulties for the second time on the last occasion that I finished working in the government, when it became apparent that my financial savings were obviously running out. But fortunately I was dismissed, so I got the chance to earn a little more money.

Speculation on Possible Government Split Over Budget

PM0112193193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 93 First Edition p 1

[Report by Vasiliy Kononenko: "Budget Battles May Cause Split in Russia's Government"]

[Text] All the signs are that the lightning visit made 30 November by several members of the government to Valday, where Prime Minister V. Chernomyrdin is on vacation at the moment, can be regarded as an unusual event. Otherwise why would Vice Premiers O. Soskovets, Ye. Gaydar, and B. Fedorov, along with Central Bank Chairman V. Gerashchenko and the representatives of a number of departments, cross a whole day off their tight work schedules.

There turned out to be a weighty reason—they came to win the game of adopting a "tough" anti-inflationary budget, a game that has been under way for a long time now between the two main groupings in the cabinet of ministers. This may turn into an uncompromising battle and may even mean the resignation of some members of the government.

The point is that, as the parliamentary elections draw closer, the differences of position and views on the course of reform between certain vice premiers, primarily Ye. Gaydar, B. Fedorov, S. Shakhray, and A. Shokhin, are becoming increasingly marked. The first pair advocate tough steps to curb inflation, while the latter favor a "softly-softly," protectionist budget.

In fact this was apparent even before. However, team solidarity virtually always gained the upper hand as the means of self-preservation in the face of the powerful pressure on the government from the former Supreme Soviet. This cementing factor is no more, and government members' affiliation to a particular party or bloc is obliging them to act in accordance with their avowed election programs or platforms. And the result has not been long in coming.

A fresh round of confrontation lies ahead following the split into at least two camps that appeared around three weeks ago during the first discussion of the budget for the fourth quarter this year and for 1994.

News agencies have reported that it proved possible to reach accords on budget matters at Valday and to find additional sources of funding for the fuel and energy complex. However, according to one expert who wished to remain anonymous, the main aim of the trip to see the premier was to persuade him to opt for the "tough" version of the budget, and this task has largely been fulfilled. The plan is to keep the state budget deficit based on the year's results at 10 percent of GNP.

It is too early to conclude this saga. Before its adoption the budget is discussed with the leaders of the main departments, and virtually all members of the government voice their comments and suggestions. That is why the Cabinet did not succeed in adopting the essential document at the last government session 11 November. Ahead of the session it was largely Ye. Gaydar who was working on it and he summoned ministers in turn. There were many who "wept" for their sector, and most department leaders foretold collapse in their sector if their proposals for increases in appropriations are ignored. Gaydar managed to adjust the spending figures by only 300 billion rubles. Regrettably, the "weeping" reached the premier, opinion among his deputies was divided, and the draft budget was set aside for additional work.

This time the picture may repeat itself primarily because the premier was mainly visited by the supporters of an anti-inflationary policy. Vice Premiers A. Zaveryukha, S. Shakhray, and A. Shokhin are another matter. Harsh objections can be expected from them. Even leaving aside personal reasons (S. Shakhray has always kept aloof from the economic bloc within the government; A. Shokhin distanced himself from Ye. Gaydar back in fall 1992) party commitments are bound to come into play in the adoption of such an important document. And these commitments are plain to see.

For instance, unlike the Gaydar-Fedorov concept of financial stabilization, which presupposes tough financial and credit policy, the liberalization of foreign economic activity, intensified privatization, etc, their opponents are proposing:

Shakhray and Shokhin, as representatives of the Party of Russian Unity and Accord: slow stabilization and "sensible protectionism" of industry, which will inevitably lead to the predominance of state-monopoly corporations;

A. Zaveryukha, as a representative of the Agrarian Party: a state program to protect commodity producers, primarily rural producers, which can only be ensured via massive budget investment and the practice of preferential credit provision.

Thus their incompatible views of the budget and their party commitments, with which some voters are already familiar, will most likely lead to a head-on clash between the above protagonists on budget policy. And, as before, compromise is virtually impossible. Either grouping may announce its resignation. That step may prove politically effective. On the other hand, if the anti-inflationary budget is shot down in flames, the premier or the president may remind them of their promise to all pull together, which would also be virtually tantamount to resignation. In short, the budget must be adopted as a matter of urgency and the denouement seems to be drawing nigh.

Soskovets Comments on Economic Conference

MK0112132093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 3

[Report by Nikolay Podlipskiy and Radmir Kilmatov: "Government Holds Economic Conference in Valday. Economic Quartet Meets With Prime Minister"]

[Text] The announcement on completing the drafting of Russia's budget, which was made 26 November by First Deputy Prime Minister Oleg Soskovets, turned out to be premature. Yesterday, Oleg Soskovets and Yegor Gaydar held yet another conference on the federal budget with Boris Fedorov and Viktor Gerashchenko at a government residence in Valday, where Viktor Chernomyrdin is lounging on vacation. The meeting of the Council of Ministers' "economic bloc" ended late at night, so its results can be assessed only by a short interview Mr. Soskovets gave at Vnukovo-2 airport to representatives of the mass media.

According to Oleg Soskovets, the meeting with the prime minister focused on the results of Russia's economic performance in the 11 months of this year, the drafting of next year's budget, and relations with the CIS countries. It is obvious, however, that the matters are not so urgent as to have caused a drastic change in the deputy prime ministers' work schedule and the prime minister's vacation itinerary. Given this, it is the second part of the meeting, devoted to adjusting the government's plan of action with regard to economic reform and the final approval of this year's budget, that was of crucial importance. The key to understanding the situation can be found in a phrase dropped by Oleg Soskovets: "It is necessary to find methods of developing the national economy through intensifying production, but without forgetting about financial stabilization." If it reflects not only the first deputy prime minister's personal opinion, but also a political decision made by government leaders on "promoting investment" by all means (obviously, this will be primarily government investment), this amounts to nothing less than a drastic shift in emphasis regarding the Russian Government's economic priorities. In this event, we should expect in the very near future a revitalization of the industrial policy concept drawn up by the State Industrial Committee, which puts emphasis on the inflationary financing of economic restructuring.

Presumably, an immediate reason for making this decision was pressure from sectoral lobbyists, which was recently accompanied by serious social conflicts: the Vorkuta miners' threat to launch a strike and the unprecedented—for Gazprom—strike in Nadym. A search for a compromise, which was bound to affect annual budget figures, has been compounded by the fact that, on one hand, the Council of Ministers has undertaken to hold the budget deficit down to 11-13 trillion rubles (it is worth noting that as a result of "agreeing" with the agrarians and representatives of the military- industrial sector on this figure, it increased by 1.5-2 trillion rubles, Oleg Soskovets said); on the other, it is necessary to satisfy the miners' demands, which may also affect the year's financial results. From an economic point of view, virtually the sole way out of this situation is for the government to close money losing mines on a mass scale. The government's active steps in this area, however, have been hindered by social reasons (which the executive authorities cannot ignore on the eve of elections). As a matter of fact, some government members think that the miners' problems could be resolved in a classical market fashion—to leave everything as it is and let the mines close "in a natural way," on the basis of the Bankruptcy Law. A decline in coal production, inevitable in this event, will be made up by a corresponding drop in demand owing to bankruptcies of metallurgy and chemical enterprises.

At the same time, Yegor Gaydar's virtually inconsequential trip to Vorkuta (the miners' strike may still begin today) gives grounds to infer that in addition to "unconventional" methods—such as instructing revenue services to go easy on the mines' banking accounts (this proposal has already been heard at a government meeting) or selling some values from the State Precious Metals Committee—the government will also find money in order to satisfy to the letter all demands voiced by the miners. This decision confirms KOMMERSANT-DAILY experts' forecast that the government will not venture (even in the absence of a parliament) to restructure the economy at a stepped-up pace by taking measures unpopular with the voters.

Regional Affairs

Shakhray: Russia Should Maintain CIS Military Presence

LD0112221393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Vice Premier Sergey Shakhray, leader of the Russian Unity and Concord Party (PRES) said at a news conference that Russia had granted 10.5 Tn rubles in credits for CIS member nations in the last years. Speaking in Perm, a stopover in his electoral campaign tour, he said that these credits were used to buy fuel from the Russian Federation.

Shakhray thinks that Russia should maintain military as well as an economic presence in the Commonwealth. "If Russian troops are withdrawn from Transcaucasia, Central Asia and other regions, the vacuum will be immediately filled by Iranian, Turkish and other army units," he thinks. The vice premier said that appropriate treaties must be concluded with CIS member states if the Russian military presence is to be preserved. He also called for evacuating the families of Russian servicemen from war zones.

In answering questions, Shakhray said that a treaty with Georgia must protect Russian interests in that Transcaucasian republic while keeping Georgia a sovereign and territorially integral state.

He did not think that PRES could join the Russia's Choice bloc. He said that Yegor Gaydar had offered him to lead that bloc.

The vice premier is to fly on to Ufa on December 1.

Shakhray Party To Back Chernomyrdin as Prime Minister

LD0112145693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1131 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Russian Vice Premier and leader of the Party of Russian Unity and Concord Sergey Shakhray declared that the party has backed and would back Viktor Chernomyrdin for the post of prime minister. Speaking at a meeting with workers in Perm on Wednesday, he pointed out that his party opposes "cavalry methods in the reforms process." To this effect Shakhray reported that the Party of Russian Unity and Concord would render support to those members of the Council of Ministers who had come to the government from the industry.

Speaking about the problems of the military-industrial complex, the vice premier advocated granting rights to the defense enterprises to independently sell military products but to primarily determine several countries with which it is prohibited to trade with arms and lists of armaments not destined for sale. According to Shakhray, the military-industrial complex enterprises should be exempted from customs tariffs for at least 3 years. As experts estimate, they will be able to overcome the crisis situation over this period of time.

Shakhray also spoke in favor of toughing punishment for criminal crimes and expanding of authorities for law enforcement bodies. The vice premier also expressed opinion that the growth of crime in some Russian cities had reached such a level when it is necessary to introduce a state of emergency. He mentioned Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk as an example.

Yavlinskiy Not To Ally With 'Government' Parties

LD0112150193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1319 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Nadezhda Potapova]

[Text] Yekaterinburg December 1 TASS—"We cannot bloc with 'government' parties", economist Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, leader of a moderate reform bloc who is now on an elections campaign in the administrative centre of the Urals industrial region, told ITAR-TASS on Wednesday [1 December].

Thus he showed his straightforward negative attitude towards the latest proposal of the Russia's Choice leadership to withdraw candidates if another democratically-minded competitor has a better chance to win.

Yavlinskiy stressed that the ruling politicians "fail to analyse negative changes of the past two years, particularly such as the aggravation of relations with other former republics of the USSR and appearing tiredness of the population".

Yavlinskiy reiterated his discontent over the conditions, organisation and terms of the elections to a fresh parliament as well as with conducting a simultaneous referendum on a new draft constitution.

Nevertheless, he expressed hope that "enough people with normal morality and sober mind" will be elected to the new parliament.

Merger of Moscow, Oblast Denied by Both Chiefs

MK0112130093 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 2

[Report by Nikolay Andreyev: "Moscow and Oblast Are Not One"]

[Text] Yesterday's issue of NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA carried a story "Will a Moscow Federal Okrug [district] Be Created?" which said that Moscow was allegedly going to make Moscow Oblast its "appendage," a dormitory suburb, "a place for the construction of cottages by well-off members of the again emergent middle class." The oblast administration allegedly opposes this. The story was flanked by a draft edict of the Russian Federation president on a administrative-territorial unification of the city of Moscow and Moscow Oblast.

In this connection, Moscow Mayor Yu. Luzhkov and A. Tyazhlov, head of the Moscow Oblast administration, made a joint statement noting that no official documents on merging Moscow with the oblast to form what is termed a federal okrug has been considered by municipal council and the administration officials. Neither the president nor his staff have planned such an okrug.

"Publications on the theme of uniting Moscow and the oblast," the statement further underlines, "are nothing but a provocation leading to a destabilization of society during the election campaign."

But where did the president's draft edict come from, after all? Yu. Luzhkov stated yesterday that according to his information, it had been done by the State Committee for Nationalities Policy, an agency led by S.

Shakhray. Why this committee should have strayed into someone else's province is totally incomprehensible to Moscow and oblast chiefs.

Nonparliamentary Opposition Movement Formed in Moscow

MK0112151093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 1

["Ye.K." report under the "In Brief" column: "Democratic Opposition Create Their Own Movement"]

[Text] A conference has been held in Moscow to found a Movement for the Protection of Democracy and Human Rights. Its leader Gleb Pavlovskiy told your NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA correspondent that "the main task of the movement is forming the basis for the creation of an extraparliamentary opposition to bring pressure to bear on the Federal Assembly and to involve fresh forces into politics." The conference passed a "Declaration" appraising the 3 and 4 October events as "a coup d'etat staged by the president and his entourage." Human Rights Day is 10 December, and the movement intends to hold its first mass actions.

Moscow Air Defense District Performing Well

PM0112143993 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Nov 93 p 1

[Nikolay Poroskov report: "The Air Defenses of Russia's Central Region Have Been Checked. The Results Are Reassuring"]

[Text] The latest training year in the Russian Armed Forces has passed under conditions of further reform accompanied by the troops' intensive combat training and the fulfillment of a whole series of specific new tasks. In particular, work has been started on implementing the military doctrine. The training year ends with a final check in accordance with the defense minister's plan. Moscow Air Defense District has been one of those checked. The commission was headed by Colonel General Georgiy Kondratyev, Russian Federation deputy minister of defense.

Why is such heightened attention being paid to the district and to the Air Defense Forces as a whole? Speaking at a briefing on the subject of "the state of the air defenses of Russia's central region under conditions of military reform," Col. Gen. Kondratyev focused attention on the fact that aerospace is today becoming one of the most important spheres of armed struggle. Aerospace assault forces are capable of being deployed quickly and making massive surprise strikes. They can be expected to go into action after a relatively short period of threat and from practically any air direction. It is essential to be ready for this.

The Russian president's edict on organizing aerospace defense was the basis for reforming and developing the Air Defense Forces under the new conditions. Moscow Air Defense District is one of the main formations in the structure of the state's air defenses. The district's troops are stationed on the territory of 24 oblasts and three republics of Russia and control the airspace over an area of 1.3 million square km. The total length of the borders for which they are responsible is 4,000 km. The district's units and commands cover 141 installations, of which 17 are in the top link of state management, 59 are in the Russian Federation Armed Forces, 14 present radiation and nuclear hazards (including six nuclear electric power stations), and 11 are large cities and industrial centers. Some 2,400 servicemen are on alert duty right round the clock.

The district was checked on various parameters: combat and mobilization readiness, management organization, the condition of armament, hardware, and stocks of materiel, commander training, mastery of new hardware, discipline, the troops' service, and much besides. Running ahead, I will say that the rating was high: The troops are ready to fulfill their proper tasks.

It took considerable effort to secure this rating. The check was far from static in nature. Reduced combat crews of three antiaircraft missile battalions and a squadron of interceptor fighters from various regions of the European part of the country were promptly transferred to a southern range. Let us add that they were raised from an alert duty regime—which has not been done in the Russian Army before. Airmen in MiG-31's hit unmanned aircraft, and S-300 surface-to-air missile system crews hit target missiles flying at speeds of 600-800 meters a second at altitudes between 300 and 2,000 meters.

The checkers placed the airmen and missilemen under conditions such that it seemed impossible to fulfill the combat task. But all the targets were hit. Based on the results of the check, 17 people were rewarded with valuable gifts and money prizes, while Lieutenant Colonels Sergey Rutskiy and Sergey Chukarin, commanders of air defense missile brigades, and Senior Lt. Igor Kotenko, air detachment navigation officer, were promoted ahead of schedule.

It must be said that the district servicemen's skill shone out not just in the final check. Col. Gen. Anatoliy Kornukov, district commander, reported that half the fighter air regiments and all the air defense missile regiments were tested on the range during the year. Firing efficiency is 95-96 percent. Some 45 checks were made of duty forces and facilities, with 117 flights by performance-grading intercept targets. In short, the district leads a strenuous combat life.

Of course, the reform of the Air Defense Forces is attended by a number of difficulties caused by the present state of the economy and the Armed Forces: the elimination of the unified air defense system of the former Union, the disruption of coproduction, the reduction in capacities for the development and production of new armament and military hardware, the reduction of Army strength, and resource restrictions. Let us add to this the undermanning, the chronically belated funding, and the strain with regard to providing housing.

Under these conditions the command and the staffs are concentrating efforts on the fullest realization of the troops' combat potential and on the preservation and rational use of costly reconnaissance and combat control systems. The troops and the Air Defense Forces receive the information they need within the borders of the zones and regions of responsibility. The undermanning has been partly offset by taking on more than 20,000 men for service under contract. Officer crews have been set up in radiotechnical and air defense missile units and are capable of performing combat operations without being reinforced by enlisted men and NCO's.... The check has shown that the district is ready to fulfill the set tasks.

Sobchak Speaks in Omsk on Party's Aims, Constitution

LD0112150393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1131 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Mayor of St. Petersburg and leader of the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms Anatoliy Sobchak told residents in the Omsk region on Wednesday that the new parliament would be "mosaic-like." In his estimate, of the 13 registered election alliances and parties, 9 will be represented in the parliament.

He said that his party's goal was "to create a normal, democratic and civilized opposition."

Previously, there was not such opportunity, he added, because the so-called irreconcilable opposition forced the Movement for Democratic Reforms to back all of the president's decisions even if they were erroneous.

Sobchak thinks that his party may fail to overcome the 5% barrier and remain outside the State Duma. Such a result, he said, will attest to the weakness of this movement.

He highly estimated the draft constitution, particularly the absence of the demagogic mention of the nations' right to self- determination and secession from Russia.

Sobchak believes that this is of cardinal significance, because over the past three years the main problem which faced the Soviet Union and subsequently the former Soviet republics was the problem of national state set-up.

The adoption of a new constitution is a task of cardinal importance, he said. The failure to adopt the new constitution would cause the situation in Russia to develop according to the Yugoslav variant.

On December 2 Sobchak is planning to visit Kemerovo, another major Siberian city.

Sobchak Speaks in Kemerovo on Constitution

LD0212111393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0827 GMT 2 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo December 2 TASS—"The participation of Russian citizens in the referendum on a new constitution will provide guarantees of the preservation of integrity of the Russian state," said Anatoliy Sobchak, mayor of St. Petersburg, coordinator of the public chamber of the constitutional conference and co- chairman of the Russian Movement of Democratic Reforms.

"Otherwise many agreements, reached previously with subjects of the federation, will be made null and void. And this may trigger developments, similar to those that are taking place in Yugoslavia." In his opinion, the developments in Moscow on October 3-4 are an indication that the danger like that does exist.

"We cannot live now, abiding by the Constitution to which more than 300 amendments have been made, including right off the microphone in parliament, which is a gross violation of the law. It is not a constitution, it is a collection of postulates that rule out each other," he said. Speaking about the advantages of the new constitution, Sobchak mentioned the direct effect of all provisions of the section, dealing with the rights and freedoms of citizens. "Private property on land will put to use the enormous potential of the country. But the land reform should be implemented in a reasonable way, without land speculation, and land should be turned over to concrete individuals," he believes.

Sobchak had a meeting with Kuzbass coal miners and local democratic public today. In the afternoon he will visit Kemerovo higher educational institutions. In addition, he is expected to speak on local tv.

Tatar Chief Spurns Federation Council, Urges Talks

MK0112133093 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 49, 5 Dec 93 (Signed to press 30 Nov) p A12

[Interview with Tatarstan President Mintimer Shaymiyev by INTERFAX correspondent Guzel Fazullina "especially for MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI"; place and date not given; under the "Tatarstan" rubric: "Things Will Not Go as Far as To Allow the Use of Force"]

[Text] [Fazullina] Has the Tatarstan leaders' refusal to run for the Council of the Federation anything to do with the republic's special stance?

[Shaymiyev] Not so much with the republic's stance, but rather with my conviction that seats at the Federal Assembly's upper chamber of a genuinely federal state should be allocated ex officio. The regions' interests should be represented by their leaders—popularly elected presidents and lawfully elected legislatures.

At the meeting of heads of the Federation components with the Russian president before the draft constitution was made public an attempt was made to set forth this particular principle for forming the upper chamber, which is actually what the draft fundamental law calls for. But this idea had to be given up, because the nomination of candidates had started by that time.

As for the elections for the State Duma, our approaches have not been heeded. As in other regions, independent

candidates have been nominated representing various parties and movements. We have not tried to intervene in this process or to regulate it, as we have created all the requisite conditions so that the citizens could freely express their will.

[Fazullina] Candidates for Federal Assembly seats represent, for the most part, Moscow-based parties. Do you think this lineup of the highest legislative body will be able to promote the regions' interests in sufficiently full measure?

[Shaymiyev] I do not think that it will be done to a sufficiently full extent. But, on the other hand, I do not think that the Federal Assembly will become a "rubber-stamp" parliament that could be easily manipulated by the president and his team. There will be no full unanimity.

[Fazullina] Which parties do you think reflect the regions' interests most fully?

[Shaymiyev] On the political side, Shakhray's party; on the economic side, Yavlinskiy's; with regard to reform, Gaydar's. Government members' participation in the electoral campaign, to my mind, puts their rivals at a disadvantage from the outset. The current economic situation is extremely difficult, and there is no realistic hope that it will get better. It is essential to talk about this honestly.

[Fazullina] What is your assessment of the draft constitution?

[Shaymiyev] This is a constitution of a unitary state that has been decoratively draped as a federation. This should also be said honestly and openly, without attempting to present the draft as a democratic document.

[Fazullina] How will differences between Russia and Tatarstan be reconciled then?

[Shaymiyev] Our constitution was adopted one year ago, and it is in no way inferior to the Russian one in terms of its democratic nature and correspondence to international law, particularly with regard to human rights. It is within the constitutional scope of these two fundamental laws that talks will continue. They will not be easy! But Article 11 of Russia's draft constitution provides for a legal procedure for concluding bilateral treaties.

[Fazullina] Tatarstan, which has not signed the treaty, has a possibility to conduct talks. And what about other republics?

[Shaymiyev] Accord can be reached only through talks, there are no other ways. The constitution is far from perfect and there are articles that require expansion; many things have not been taken into account, and this process should be based on agreement. However tough the center might like to appear, there is a path that has in fact been trodden; there are approaches to resolving similar problems. Let us recall how Tatarstan was criticized for its policy of "a soft entry" into a market economy, but presently it is Gaydar's shock therapy that is considered mistaken. I think that time will give everyone his due all the same. Things will not go as far as to allow the use of force.

Tatar Parliament Urges Nonparticipation on 12 Dec

LD0112222393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] The Tatar Milli-Mejlis (parliament) rejects the draft constitution of Russia and calls on the electors not to participate in the December 12 elections or referendum. A parliamentary meeting passed a resolution pointing out that the draft constitution submitted for popular vote runs counter to the national interests of Russia's ethnic minorities, including the Tatars.

The Milli-Mejlis believes that the document was designed to liquidate the sovereignty of national republics and that of Tatarstan most of all, as the republic had failed to sign the Federative Treaty and was barred from the development of the draft constitution.

"The new constitution is the way to neo-colonialism since all ethnic formations will be lowered to the rank of provinces, while Russia's minorities will be deprived of representation in state bodies and their statehood," the body believes.

The Tatar parliament called on the Russian people and the country's ethnic minorities not to participate in the elections and referendum on December 12.

Tatarstan DPR Calls For U.S. Election Observers

LD0112222793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] The Tatarstan branch of the Democratic Party of Russia (DPR) called on the U.S. embassy in Moscow to send observers to that republic to supervise the elections and referendum there on December 1 [date as received]. It said that there are mixed feelings in Tatarstan about the voting and that therefore, international supervision was needed in the cities and towns of Kazan, Naberezhnye Chelny, Chistopol, Zelyyonodolsk and Leninogorsk.

Rashit Akhmetov, co-chairman of the Tartarstan branch of the (DPR) and candidate to the State Duma, told Interfax that the low activity of the electorate was influenced by the position of authorities and a propaganda campaign mounted by nationalist and communist opponents of the elections and referendum, as well as by the social tension and disillusionment which pervades Russia.

Akhmetov said that the 100,000 rubles given to each candidate did not cover the expenses even of printing leaflets. Local newspapers want to have 200,000 to 1 Mn [million] rubles for every campaigning publication, a rate they charge for advertisements. Only 15 minute radio and TV addresses are free, Akhmetov said.

Tatar Parliament Turns Down Draft Constitution

MK0212090093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 86, 2 Dec 93 (Signed to press 1 Dec) p 1

[INTERFAX report: "Parliament Calls for Voting Against Russian Federation Draft Constitution]

[Text] Tatarstan's parliament turns down the Russian Federation draft constitution and calls upon voters to stay away from the elections and referendum on 12 December. A directive passed at a session of the parliament presidium points out that the draft constitution being put to the all-Russia referendum contradicts the national interests of Russia's indigenous peoples, including the interests of the Tatar people. The parliament thinks that the Russian Federation draft constitution is aimed at scrapping the sovereignty of republics, and primarily the sovereignty of Tatarstan, which did not sign the Federation Treaty and which has been virtually debarred from drawing up the draft. The parliament called upon the Russian Federation's indigenous peoples and the Russian people to stay away from the elections and the referendum on 12 December.

More on Bomb Blast at Krasnodar Newspaper Office

PM0112142193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 8

[Andrey Aderekhin report: "'White Squadron' Promises To Put an End to Corruption in Kuban"]

[Text] Krasnodar—The newspaper KUBANSKIY KURYER only published a front page 30 November. It carried a large funeral photograph of 26-year old Yelena Tkacheva, the proofreader who died the day before as a result of a subversive explosion at the editorial office.

IZVESTIYA has already reported that an act of terrorism was carried out in Krasnodar. An explosion rang out in the very center of the city, in the building housing the newspapers KUBANSKIY KURYER, KUBANSKIYE NOVOSTI, and RASSVET along with the Leninskiy Rayon Veterans Council and other organizations.

I visited the scene. The explosive device planted on the second floor in the KUBANSKIY KURYER editorial office was so powerful that the wave of the blast demolished the wall of the proofreading office, destroyed part of the wall of the next office, tore doors off their hinges, and wrenched central heating radiators loose. A gigantic crack appeared across the facade of all three floors....

Proofreaders Irina Struzhkina and Yelena Tkacheva ended up under the debris of the demolished wall. The former was seriously injured and is now in the hospital. Yelena Tkacheva's injuries were fatal.... By chance there were no other casualties in the editorial office, where there are always lots of people.

What happened shocked the people of Krasnodar and the inhabitants of the kray. It is not after all a question of mafia showdowns, but of an attempt to force journalists to keep quiet.

KUBANSKIY KURYER Chief Editor Igor Kolomiytsev said that the editorial office has received repeated threats for a long time now....

Under the photograph of Yelena Tkacheva KURYER journalists wrote inter alia: "Planting a bomb in an editorial office is the same as leaving an explosive device in a bus or at a station in the knowledge that innocent people will die.... The scum want to frighten journalists, shut newspapers up, and kill our sense of our own dignity and freedom. They will not succeed! KURYER will publish! Just as the killers who cut short our Lena's life will be found."

In connection with the tragedy the newspaper VOLNAYA KUBAN announced that a "statement by the white squadron [belyy eskadron]" appeared on the entrance to its own editorial office, saying the following: "We aim to physically eliminate in Kuban hardened criminals and corrupt servants of Justice in league with them."

The Russian Ministry of Security's Krasnodar Kray Directorate said that extremist and nationalist organizations are increasingly embarking on acts of terror. The explosion at the KURYER editorial office was the 41st criminal explosion in the Kuban this year.

Samara Voting Intentions Poll Results Published

PM0112172193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 4

[Report by Mariya Matskevich in St. Petersburg and Vladimir Zvonovskiy in Samara: "As Samara Votes, So the Country Will Vote"]

[Text] After the publication of the final list of parties and blocs allowed to take part in the 12 December elections, the Samara social studies foundation under the Leonid Keselman Center's program has once again polled 2,500 local voters. The figures obtained attest that today one in every five Samara voters (20 percent) does not intend to take part in the elections.

Among those who at present are inclined to go to the polling stations (that is, do not refuse to take part in the elections) nearly one third (30 percent) have not yet decided who they will vote for (in mid-October the figure was 39 percent and in early October 37 percent) and a further 6 percent do not trust any of the election blocs and parties left on the list.

The experience of the Leonid Keselman Center's studies in the periods of previous election campaigns shows that virtually all those who have refused to trust any contender will not take part in the voting. Thus today we can expect that approximately 63-64 percent of registered voters will take part in the elections (the results of the October poll allowed us to hope only for 57-59 percent awhile the results of the previous November poll allowed us to hope for 58-60 percent).

It follows from this that the "Russia's Choice" bloc could count today on approximately 34 percent of the votes (as against 46 percent in October and 36 percent in early

November), the Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin bloc can count on 9 percent (the respective results in October and early November were 15 and 12 percent), the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms can count on 6 percent (in October and early November the figures were 8 and 9 percent respectively), and the Russian Party of Unity and Accord headed by S. Shakhray can count on 6 percent (in early November the figure was approximately the same—7 percent).

Zyuganov's communist party can at present count on 13 percent of the votes in Samara (in October the figure was 10 percent, in early November already 13 percent) while Zhirinovskiy's party can count on 5 percent (3 percent in October).

The chances of Travkin's Democratic Party of Russia with Samara voters today are 6 percent of the votes (in October the figure was 11 percent, and three weeks ago the same as now, 6 percent). To judge by today's results the novice in the political struggle—the "Women of Russia" political bloc headed by A. Fedulova and N. Gundareva—can claim to receive 7 percent of the votes.

All the other political parties are so far failing to pass the 5 percent threshold in the Samara voters' preference.

Speaking as a whole, if the "communist-patriots" combination can now hope for approximately 18-20 percent of the votes in Samara the union of just the three blocs of democratic orientation ("Russia's Choice," "Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin," and the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms) can count on almost three times more support from voters.

International Affairs

Yeltsin Reaction to START I Decision Cited

LD0112205693 Kiev KIEVSKIYE VEDOMOSTI in Russian 30 Nov 93

[Article: "Russia Has Described the Ratification of START I as a False 'Start' and Is Now Threatening Ukraine With Isolation"]

[Text] Repeated attempts by the president of Ukraine to telephone Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin to discuss the Ukrainian parliament's decision on ratifying "START I" proved unsuccessful. Not counting the rather strongly worded reaction to the decision by Andrey Kozyrev, who perceives in it a desire on Ukraine's part to remain a nuclear state, there was no more official reaction from Russia for a long time. However, there was a clear tendency to stir things up in the world's press. All the main papers in the world, from IZVESTIYA to THE WASHINGTON POST, concluded that Ukraine aspires to retain its nuclear weapons.

However, eight days later the government of the Russian Federation described the Ukrainian parliament's ratification of "START I" as "a sham" while the official position of the president of Russia in its final version was communicated to the Ukrainian side a day later.

VEDOMOSTI has learned from extremely reliable sources that last Friday Russian President Boris Yeltsin sent Leonid Kravchuk an extremely strongly worded telegram about the consequences which may await Ukraine as a result of our parliament's recent ratification of "START I."

First, the Russian leader is laying down a lot of reservations, which greatly limit the extent of compensation that Ukraine hopes to receive. Regarding settlements for warheads already withdrawn to Russia, then to all appearances we will not receive a penny for them from Moscow.

Second, Boris Yeltsin is insisting that Ukraine destroy the solid-fuel missiles of the "Satan" type in the first instance. Moreover, the president of Russia, it is reported, has demanded that the dismantlement of nuclear missile weapons be conducted in the minimum period of time, and has promised, should the opposite be the case, to get the world community to put pressure on Ukraine. He also resorts to such an argument as refusing to assist us with technical specialists, and also refusing to assist us in transporting nuclear weapons. It is true, a reservation follows that this is not a final decision.

Boris Nikolayevich reproaches Ukraine for not being a reliable partner in interstate relations, and indirectly recommends that Leonid Makarovych act on the decision of the parliament on "START I," which Yeltsin describes as "strange," as he reacted to the Sevastopol attack by the former Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

Apart from that, there is a good chance that the United States will fully support Moscow's stance: Very vigorous consultations are currently being held between the State Department and Russia's Ministry of Internal Affairs. The variant of employing both political and economic sanctions against Ukraine is not ruled out.

It appears that no one from the superpowers and semi-superpowers intends to sympathize with Ukraine and take into account its catastrophically complex economic situation. No one intends to grant it the right to decide for itself which missiles it should get rid of in the first instance. But judging by the statement of B. Yeltsin, official Moscow is not very concerned that it is the liquid-fuel SS-19's that are threatening the ecologies of Ukraine and of all Europe, not the solid-propellant SS-24's. In addition, Russia is insisting, as in the times of stagnation, on Ukraine reporting ahead of schedule on the withdrawal of nuclear weapons, forgetting that "START I" is envisaged for seven years, and not for one or two years. As far as the unwillingness to talk about compensation to Ukraine because our state was left nuclear weapons from the former USSR is concerned, then here it seems they forgot to prompt Boris Nikolayevich on the many hundreds of closed scientific research institutes and "post boxes" of the military-industrial complex of the former Union, which while having Kiev, Kharkov, or Dnepropetrovsk registration, worked on creating both tactical and strategic nuclear weapons.

In addition, attempts to drive a wedge between the Ukrainian Parliament and president are highly dangerous. In spite of the existing differences, both branches of power should now as never before act in coordination and appropriately, and agree to mutual concessions and compromises, for an internal split will only contribute to complicating the situation. Why, even animals in jungles declare a great truce during a drought...

Apropos In the uncharacteristic IZVESTIYA article on 27 November entitled "Moscow and Washington Are to Blame for Kiev Holding on to its Nuclear Weapons," Stanislav Kondrashov maintains: "Harsh words of protest, currently being heard from the Russian Ministry of Internal Affairs, first have come too late, and second will hardly help the matter. Threats of economic sanctions are not feasible. They will punish the people, not the politicians. Anyway, sanctions will not instantaneously make up for something which has not existed, and alas does not exist in relations between Russia and Ukraine—well thought-out and laborious diplomatic work, which the infrequent meetings of the two presidents could not replace. Without dwelling too much on accusations concerning a neighbor, it is necessary to seriously examine the conditions advanced by him, having undertaken to attempt to elaborate a compromise."

The author goes on to write that "there are situations, when the scale of one's thinking and the ability to appropriately appraise expenses and gains in the light of

possible dangers are tested. One should not get something for nothing—that is a rule of American bargaining, including military-diplomatic bargaining.

"What happened in Kiev a week ago adds to the list of foreign policy failures and false steps of Clinton's administration..."

Russian Ambassador on Relations, Nuclear Arms

AU0112155993 Kiev URYADOVYY KURYER in Ukrainian 30 Nov 93 p 3

[Interview with Russian Ambassador to Ukraine Leonid Smolyakov by URYADOVYY KURYER correspondent Valeriy Dzhyhun in Kiev; date not given: "We Were Born by Ukrainian Independence"]

[Text] **These days, the Embassy of the Russian Federation in Ukraine celebrates the second anniversary of its inauguration. Ambassador Leonid Smolyakov shares his ideas with a correspondent of URYADOVYY KURYER.**

[Smolyakov] The proclamation of independence is a very serious date in the life of any people. The very fact of the breakthrough toward independence, about which the Ukrainian people dreamed for such a long time, is a colossal progressive element. Russia was the first to have recognized Ukraine as an independent state. Incidentally, our embassy car's license plate has the number 001 on it, which indicates precisely this. We were ready to recognize Ukrainian independence even before the official results of the referendum became known. It is true.

However, this word should not be absolutized either. The notion of independence never existed in a ratified form. Everything in the world is interrelated. For example, Ukraine depends upon Russian energy sources. Your economists quote the figure 90 percent. Such a dependence may be used, as some people believe, to your disadvantage. One hears that we are going to punish Ukraine. That is why I want to stress right away: The people and the government of Russia want to see Ukraine as an independent and strong state. It is easier and more pleasant to deal with a rich and advanced neighboring country. Under such conditions, it is possible to foresee further steps which this state is going to take and, when necessary, to rely upon its potential. If, on the other hand, a country is in a crisis situation, its neighbors cannot remain indifferent. We are not watching the events in Ukraine with indifference. If some people complain that Russia wants to bring Ukraine to its knees by closing gas supplies, it is a political provocation on the part of some political leaders who strive to see the source of Ukraine's misfortunes precisely in the neighbor country.

The thing is that there is such a notion as debt and payment for those resources which are supplied from Russia. We cannot make Ukraine an object of our philanthropic care. It would be humiliating for Ukraine, which is such a huge country with such rich resources.

Let us discuss a specific example. That same gas. It needs to be extracted. The workers must receive payment for their labor. If Ukraine takes gas and does not pay money for it, the Russian gas miners remain without wages. They are now beginning to rebel. There arises a problem. Who is to blame?... That is why a strict coordination at an interstate level is necessary: The organization of production, financial system, and guarantees. One needs to be able to make compromises, issue shares of enterprises, and so on.

We agreed to the known bargaining with regard to the fleet. The reaction was immediate: "It is a humiliation of Ukraine's national dignity!" Why? It is a commercial agreement. It should not be looked upon as a political act. We offered one of the possible variants for resolving the problem of debt, even though it is not advantageous for Russia.

I would like politicians and the Ukrainian people to understand that Russia is not a soaker. It also has to get its resources somewhere. In turn, some Russian party leaders also resort to populist pre-election slogans—"Everything must be closed!" "Only for Russia!" This again leads to a new confrontation. That is why both states must use a realistic approach and focus their attention, first and foremost, on resolving economic problems.

The Russian diplomatic mission in Ukraine was born by your independence. Had there been no independent Ukrainian state, there would have been no diplomatic relations between our two countries. That is why this is a festival for us, too. We are also two years old. The officials of the Russian Federation's Embassy in Ukraine are doing everything they can to avoid the spread of conflict situations that arise inside our states to our interstate relations. This is not so easy. We cannot do everything. Unlike bilateral interstate relations with any other country of the world, Russian-Ukrainian relations are burdened with problems: economic, political, cultural, border, and military. A very intensive negotiating process is under way. The small collective of our embassy is constantly under serious strain. However, the conditions of our stay in Kiev leave much to be desired. This applies both to the embassy building, which does not conform to all requirements, and to the housing conditions in which our diplomats live. We still live in hotels and pay enormous sums of money per day. To get a room, we must turn to a Ukrainian government minister or deputy minister. As you understand, this does not improve our moods. However, we work and want the Ukrainian people to trust our diplomatic mission and Russia as a whole. You should not see in our state your enemy, who wants to return Ukraine to slavery. Russia itself was in totalitarian bondage. That is why we, like the Ukrainian people, must also build our statehood. If we do this by joint efforts, it will be a much easier task. The peoples feel their historical affinity. There exist countries where differences between linguistic dialects are much greater than those between the Ukrainian and Russian languages. Do not create problems where they should not be.

This particularly refers to military issues, in particular, with regard to the storage of nuclear weapons on the territory of Ukraine. One cannot help feeling surprised at statements on the need to keep nuclear missiles in case of a threat.... What kind of talk is this? Does somebody seriously think of engaging in warfare with Russia? Can there emerge a phantom for Ukraine to use nuclear weapons? This is such nonsense! Meanwhile, some politicians turn the weapons into an element of threats and demand some inconceivable guarantees. Don't they understand that it is just nuclear garbage? If it had not been for the certainty that it may, some day, become a tenfold Chernobyl, Russia would have closed its eyes to this problem long ago.

Diplomacy is a civilized form of politics. We are trying to see to it that it remains such not only in terms of form, but also in terms of content to the benefit of our two peoples. If we succeed in this, our mission will be fulfilled.

Foreign Affairs Official Views Nuclear Issues

LD0112160293 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 2300 GMT 30 Nov 93

[Text] Kiev, 30 Nov—"Ukraine is an independent state in a currency, military-political, and territorial respect and its membership of the CIS cannot be considered as participating in building up a new form of the Soviet empire," stressed Dmytro Pavlychko, chairman of the Supreme Council's foreign affairs commission during an official meeting between a delegation from the French Senate and representatives of Ukraine's parliamentary commissions for issues of defense, foreign affairs, and economic reform.

He informed members of the delegation—representatives of the Senate's commission for issue of defense and the armed forces and the foreign affairs commission—about the political and economic relations between Ukraine and Russia. Dmytro Pavlychko stressed that the ratification by Ukraine of START I was the first step on the path to a nonnuclear state but that the transition to it will be in stages from the point of view of the fact that the Russian Federation is violating the agreement reached earlier.

Ukraine has not received compensation for the destruction of tactical nuclear weapons. "If the international community, and France in particular, will not support Ukraine in its just demands concerning the payment by Russia of compensation for the destruction of 36 percent of the nuclear delivery systems and 42 percent of the warheads, Ukraine will be forced to temporarily suspend further actions in the direction of disarmament, since we regard the presence of nuclear weapons in a state as a guarantor of national security and a material worth of a state," said the head of the Ukrainian parliamentary commission.

During their stay in Kiev the French deputies plan to meet the defense and environment ministers and the chairman of the Supreme Council.

French Reaction to START I Decision Noted

LD0112174293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1620 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Paris December 1 TASS—France has called on Ukraine to fulfil its obligations in nuclear disarmament.

France has always urged Ukraine to fulfil its obligations taken under the 1992 Lisbon protocol which provides for its joining the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a nuclear-free state and ratification of the START-1 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. Ukraine's conditions for fulfilling these obligations are inadmissible, French Foreign Ministry spokesman Richard Duquet said on Wednesday.

National Affairs

Decree Names National Security Council Members

WS0212114293 Kiev Ukrayinske Radio First Program Network in Ukrainian 0600 GMT 2 Dec 93

[Text] The new composition of the National Security Council, headed by President Leonid Kravchuk, has been approved by virtue of the Presidential Decree on Changing the Composition of the National Security Council of Ukraine. Henceforth the permanent members of the council are President Leonid Kravchuk, acting Prime Minister Yukhym Zvyahilskyy, Interior Minister Andriy Vasylyshyn, Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko, Security Service Chief Yevhen Marchuk, Defense Minister Vitaliy Radetskyy, and Deputy Prime Minister Valeriy Shmarov.

START Committee Member on Nuclear Intentions

WS0112155993 Kiev KYYIVSKA PRAVDA in Ukrainian 26 Nov 93 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Ihor Derkach, member of the Supreme Council committee to prepare START I for ratification, by Y. Lystopad; place and date not given: "Pros and Cons of the Nuclear Image"]

[Text] [Lystopad] Regardless of claims that Ukraine cannot control its nuclear arms, the very fact of possessing these arms gives Ukraine a certain weight in the world. It is difficult to find arguments proving that this image is worthless.

[Derkach] I do not think that Ukraine should get rid of its nuclear status either today or in the immediate future. This might have tragic consequences. The status should be maintained at least until the year 2005.

We need nuclear arms to guarantee peace in Ukraine and peaceful relations with our neighbors. World experience demonstrates that states possessing nuclear arms are not subject to foreign aggression.

We do not have complete operational control over these arms, but Ukraine is carrying out administrative control over nuclear missiles, including the 43d Missile Army subordinated to the Ukrainian Defense Ministry. This is a relevant factor influencing other states' behavior.

[Lystopad] Why did Ukraine commit to eliminating 36 percent of carriers and 42 percent of warheads? Proceeding from the declared intention to go nonnuclear, a zero variant would be more logical.

[Derkach] These figures represent the minimum envisioned by Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Gorbachev's time. Later, these figures became compulsory for the successors of the USSR.

[Lystopad] However, nothing prevented lawmakers from adopting a resolution to eliminate more arms. It is known that the president insisted on the zero variant.

[Derkach] Yes. The president's standpoint was: "Let us withdraw all nuclear arms and stop playing with the nuclear status." In my opinion, this stance was doomed. The president either wants to evade problems caused by possessing nuclear arms or is afraid to seriously handle nuclear issues. In general, possessing nuclear arms demands resolute political leaders.

[Lystopad] Will Ukraine be allowed to denounce the treaty if the situation dramatically changes in the future—say an outright aggressor emerges in Europe, as occurred in the Middle East a couple of years ago?

[Derkach] We will only observe the treaty if our state is granted national security. If anybody voices territorial claims toward Ukraine, uses blackmail, or economic blockade, and other states fail to normalize the situation, this would give us a right to change our standpoint. This is not a unilateral agreement which means that Ukraine is not the only side with commitments.

[Lystopad] The limitation of nuclear arms to the declared level is going to cost Ukraine about $1.7 billion. This is an exorbitant sum for Ukraine in its current situation. Ukraine is counting on foreign assistance that is still uncertain. Thus, observing the treaty might become equally uncertain.

[Derkach] Nuclear arms are not a thing to play games with. The United States and other countries must realize that, even more so since Ukraine's disarmament is in their interest. If they refuse to assist, this would amount to choosing a negative stance toward nuclear disarmament in general. I believe in Western assistance in this issue regardless of the progress of economic reform in Ukraine.

However, the situation is more complicated concerning Russia's assistance. Ukraine must receive compensation for enriched uranium contained in warheads in either money or heat-emitting elements for nuclear power plants. Negotiations with Russia regarding this compensation present the most complicated problem. We have not received a penny for tactical nuclear arms transferred to Russia.

I am an advocate of drafting a tripartite agreement on compensation signed by Ukraine, Russia, and the United States, for example. The United States might become the side granting the observance of the agreement by Russia. Thus, if Russia walked out on its promises, its commitments would be carried out by a third side. I have no illusions regarding Russia's desire to assist Ukraine in observing the provisions of START I, especially those dealing with compensation. I am afraid that Russia will try to cheat us because certain forces there are still dreaming of stripping Ukraine of its statehood.

[Lystopad] Why did the legislature not ratify the fifth article of the Lisbon Protocol which envisioned Ukraine joining the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty?

[Derkach] I want to remind you that the Lisbon Protocol was signed by Ukrainian Foreign Minister Zlenko, U.S. Secretary of State Baker, and representatives of Russia, Belarus, and Kazakhstan in May 1992. Its essence was to make the newly independent states successors to the nuclear commitments of the USSR, imposed on the latter by START I. However, the fifth article contradicts reality. It deems Ukraine a nonnuclear state, which was neither true in May 1992 nor is it true today. This article presents a danger to Ukraine's interests. If we agreed to it, Russia would immediately become the owner of our nuclear arms.

[Lystopad] I have another question regarding expenditures. There are concerns that a substantial part of this burden will have to be carried by Ukraine, while elsewhere, disarmament yields profits.

[Derkach] I repeat that Ukraine cannot carry out the provisions of START I either financially or technically. Here is a simple example—we do not have big 60-tonne cranes, all kinds of measuring devices, stations for neutralizing liquid missile fuel, and so on. Thus, the participation of other states is inevitable.

I know that one U.S. company has suggested building a plant in the Republic for processing the fuel which would be advantageous both economically and ecologically. There are projects for using missiles for peaceful space flights.

If we treat the issue of implementing START I from an economic perspective, the treaty had to be preceded by a national program for many ministries. Ukraine will keep many silos and hangars crammed with unique equipment. How shall we use it? Keep in mind that arms were probably the only Soviet high-tech product.

Unfortunately, the current government cannot draft such a program. In my opinion, it is trying to get rid of the arms as soon as possible.

Security Official on Military, Nuclear Doctrine

WS0112160693 Kiev KYYIVSKA PRAVDA in Ukrainian 25 Nov 93 p 1,2

[Interview with Oleksandr Tarasenko, deputy chairman of the Committee for Arms and National Security, by P. Vasyanovych; place and date not given: "On Military and Economic Security"]

[Text] Who would know about Ukraine if it was not for our nuclear arsenal? This fact keeps experts interested in the country and makes them write about it. It also means more work for them. For example, once Ukraine adopted its military doctrine, they immediately set out to determine whether or not it intends to become a nonnuclear state. Notably, when I came to the Supreme Council to interview O. Tarasenko, deputy chairman of the Committee for Arms and National Security, on military doctrine, I ran into members of a former U.S. congressmen's delegation in his office.

[Vasyanovych] In what were your guests interested?

[Tarasenko] They offered their help to make the work of our parliament more efficient. The experience of their congressional committees would be helpful in setting priorities, preparing legal documents, and working on specific issues. They were also interested in everything that is happening in Ukraine, sentiments in the legislature, the position of specific deputies on defense issues—in one word, they were gathering information.

[Vasyanovych] Don't they already know everything? The information network works very well in Ukraine. For example, no later than the day after the Supreme Council session debated the military doctrine, the BBC cited almost verbatim the report by Defense Minister Radetskyy.

[Tarasenko] Well, some of our deputies, who seize on every occasion to pledge allegiance to Ukraine, are ready to reveal its state secrets.

[Vasyanovych] Discussion of the military doctrine was frequently postponed, and it was approved only on the third try...

[Tarasenko] Deputies had diverse attitudes toward many issues, in particular, the one whether or not Ukraine should get rid of its nuclear weapons. Everyone knows how much the West is pressing for this. Well, the basic principles of our foreign policy raise no doubts—strive for peace, nonparticipation in blocs, neutrality. All of this was incorporated in the Declaration on Sovereignty. If we had no nuclear weapons, everything would be pretty clear. But we have them, too. The military doctrine says that Ukraine became the owner of a nuclear arsenal due to historical circumstances, and the reality is that it is not able—nor does it want—to use them. The fact that our tactical nuclear arms were moved out of the country speaks about our stance. As for the strategic weapons, we will gradually phase them out, but demand reciprocal steps on the part of other countries so that the disarmament is not unilateral.

[Vasyanovych] It looks as if Ukraine is abandoning its nuclear stockpile and at the same time keeping it. Neither the United States nor Russia have yet expressed their desire to radically cut or destroy their nuclear arms. Will Ukraine wait until those countries begin to disarm?

[Tarasenko] Not everything depends on Ukraine's wishes. That we make certain conditions does not necessarily mean that other countries will want to meet them. Taking missiles off combat alert, dismantling or scrapping them is a long process. Besides, missiles should not be regarded as weapons only—their financial value is very high, especially that of the uranium contained in warheads. It would not be wise just to give it away. So, all this must be discussed in detail with due respect to the interests of each side. This will take time, though.

[Vasyanovych] Given its present economic situation, can Ukraine afford a nuclear arsenal? Is it able to ensure proper and reliable control over it?

[Tarasenko] It is very important that our nuclear launchers not be used without our permission, and we ensure this condition today. On the other hand, as long as these launchers remain operational, one must guarantee their safe operation as well as timely and efficient maintenance, which is impossible without skilled specialists. Since those specialists work primarily in Russia, we need close cooperation between our states on this issue.

[Vasyanovych] As is known, certain officials—some of them high-ranking—from some of our neighboring countries lay territorial claims to Ukraine. This applies to Romania, Poland, and Russia. How should Ukraine counter those encroachments? A military doctrine, as a rule, identifies a potential adversary...

[Tarasenko] Even though we see no adversaries around us, we stand on the principles of territorial integrity and inviolability of our borders, and expect the same from our neighbors. Ukraine should be prepared for any scenario of developments and rebut any aggressor, which complies with the principle of sufficient defense incorporated into our military doctrine. At the same time, we should conduct an efficient foreign policy and actively participate in international institutions to prevent any possible straining of relations or aggression against us.

[Vasyanovych] Our military doctrine provides for a sharp scale-down in the Armed Forces—from 730,000 to 450,000. What implications does this have for the Ukrainian economy?

[Tarasenko] Yes, this is a very acute problem. No doubt, we must reduce the Army—we do not need such a huge force. This, however, calls for substantial expenditures. One should also take care of social protection for servicemen and help them adapt to civilian life. Needless to

say, it will be difficult to provide them all with housing and jobs. Recently, servicemen held a nationwide meeting that brought up the issue of using all sources of funding, including national and foreign investments, to resolve this problem. I believe that one should actively engage in this endeavor commercial banks, which have accumulated a lot of money by now...

[Vasyanovych] Money could be supplied by enterprises in the military-industrial complex. But everyone knows that this industry is in disarray, which, to put it mildly, runs counter to the interests of Ukraine...

[Tarasenko] I am sure that this complex can boost the Ukrainian economy. We should provide our Army with our own arms and military equipment because it is much cheaper than importing it all from abroad. We should also learn how to trade in arms, as is the case throughout the world, because our arms are no worse—in many cases better—than their foreign counterparts. We have such a potential. We will create more jobs and strengthen our currency... Everyone must understand that military and economic security cannot exist without one another.

Cabinet Cancels Previous Currency Benefits

AU0212111093 Kiev URYADOVYY KURYER in Ukrainian 30 Nov 93 p 2

["Ukraine's Cabinet of Ministers Decree No. 961 on Canceling Benefits for Enterprises and Organizations Regarding Their Exemption From the Mandatory Sale of Foreign-Currency Incomes," issued in Kiev on 26 Nov]

[Text] In fulfillment of the Ukrainian presidential edict of 2 November 1993 "On Additional Measures for Improving Hard-Currency Regulation," Ukraine's cabinet of ministers decrees as follows:

To cancel, starting from 1 January 1994, all benefits previously granted by Ukraine's cabinet of ministers to enterprises and organizations regarding their exemption from the mandatory sale of foreign-currency income on the interbank currency market.

To determine that requests by ministries, departments, the Council of Ministers of the Crimean Republic, and local state administrations on providing such benefits will not be considered.

[Signed] Yu. Zvyahilskyy, Ukraine's acting prime minister I. Dotsenko, minister of Ukraine's cabinet of ministers
[Dated] 26 November 1993, Kiev

Fleet Commander Views Progress in Shipbuilding

AU0212111293 Kiev MOLOD UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 30 Nov 93 p 1

[Interview with Vice Admiral V. Bezkorovaynyy, commander of the Ukrainian Fleet, by HOLOS UKRAYINY special correspondent Volodymyr Prytula in the Crimea; date not given: "The Commander Looks Into the Future With Optimism"]

[Text] **Despite the sudden reversal over the return to Ukraine of the Black Sea Fleet, which had, in fact, been stolen from it, the interest in building up the young Ukrainian Naval Forces has not abated. Our Crimean correspondent met with the commander of the Ukrainian Fleet, Vice Admiral V. Bezkorovaynyy, and asked him to answer a few questions.**

[Prytula] Admiral, as far as I know, you are one of the authors of the concept of building Ukraine's Naval Forces. How do you see the Ukrainian Fleet?

[Bezkorovaynyy] The concept is still being worked out. That is why we have sent proposals to the highest-level officials. Of course, its main points will be based upon Ukraine's military doctrine. It is envisaged that the Naval Forces will be composed of Coastal Guard Forces and forces capable of guaranteeing trade and the safety of navigation in individual regions of the world's oceans. In view of this, Ukraine's Naval Forces will include surface and submarine forces, naval aviation, coastal guard forces, marines, and formations and units of combat, specialized, and logistic support.

[Prytula] As I understand, Admiral, the deployment areas of the Ukrainian Fleet will not only be in the Black Sea.

[Bezkorovaynyy] Ukraine's economic activity must be guaranteed in those areas of the world's oceans where this activity is taking place. A corresponding formation of ships will be created to carry out this task. Incidentally, any advanced country has such formations. Ukraine is also engaged in intensive economic activity on the rivers, in particular the Danube, where it is also necessary to guarantee the safety, first and foremost, of Ukrainian vessels. This duty must be entrusted to Ukraine's Naval Forces.

[Prytula] You have already visited Ukraine's shipbuilding plants and familiarized yourself with the way the shipbuilding program for Ukraine's Naval Forces is progressing. What are your impressions?

[Bezkorovaynyy] Yes, I have made a long trip along Ukraine's entire Black Sea coast. I examined all the shipbuilding complexes. It was necessary to see, on the spot, the possibilities for shipbuilding and, in particular, how our Naval Forces are reinforced with new ships. They are being built for the Ukrainian Fleet. There are many impressions, and they have been taken into account in the work plans throughout Ukraine's Naval Forces administration.

[Prytula] Admiral, how is the present economic situation influencing the fulfillment of the shipbuilding program?

[Bezkorovaynyy] Shipbuilding, just like the creation of any complex of weapons, requires considerable material investment and the corresponding financing. At present, this is very difficult to accomplish, but it must be stressed that the financing of all of our contracts has been completed up to the end of the current year. This

indicates a profound understanding on the part of the state leadership of this important problem—the building of Ukraine's Naval Forces.

[Prytula] It is known that the residents of many regions of our country have responded to the call to promote the building of the Ukrainian Fleet. It this assistance considerable?

[Bezkorovaynyy] Yes, of course. We have already received specific proposals from the Lvov, Ivano-Frankivsk, and Ternopil Oblasts. The leadership and public offer their services in building ships for Ukraine's Naval Forces. Nor are Kharkiv, Zaporizhzhya, Dnipropetrovsk, and Cherkasy Oblasts lagging behind. To take part in building up our Naval Forces, it is not obligatory to invest money in the building of warships particularly. Capital is also needed for building shore facilities and aviation, for creating administration bodies and command posts, for housing construction, and for resolving social problems. We feel that the people of Ukraine have responded to our problems and are ready to render extensive assistance. The Hutsul, Pokut, and Galician funds for building the Ukrainian Fleet have been created. Hundreds of millions of karbovantsi are streaming into their accounts. Our task is to direct everything into the practical channel of building Ukraine's Naval Forces. Through your newspaper, I want to express sincere gratitude to all those who are helping us.

[Prytula] Admiral, how do you see relations between Ukraine's Naval Forces and the Black Sea Fleet?

[Bezkorovaynyy] The problem of dividing the Black Sea Fleet is a political one, and it is not up to me or the Black Sea Fleet commander, Admiral E. Baltin, to resolve it. This task is for heads of our states—the presidents of Ukraine and Russia. Our task, since we live, work, command our subunits and units, and resolve common issues on the same territory and in the same city, is to do everything in such a way that our actions should not cause internal complications or confrontation in the region, that the normal living atmosphere in the Crimea and in Sevastopol should not be disrupted, and that our actions should not affect Ukrainian-Russian interstate relations. Today, the people are very frustrated, because the problem has not been finally resolved. Therefore, I believe that it is necessary to create in Sevastopol, for example, a department, subordinated to the head of state administration, which would be composed of representatives of state bodies and military formations stationed in the city. It could be headed by a representative of the state administration. While coordinating the actions of these structures, this body could resolve many pressing problems, prevent conflict situations, and provide objective information. Relations with the Black Sea Fleet commander are being established. I believe that all the questions may be resolved painlessly. This was confirmed by our meeting with Admiral Eduard Baltin. We have known each other for a long time from our service in the Northern Fleet. I am sure that business relations, which took shape earlier, will also be maintained.

[Prytula] Incidentally, your colleague E. Baltin, in a recent interview, expressed serious concern about the arrival of ships from NATO countries in the Black Sea. What is your point of view on this problem?

[Bezkorovaynyy] When warships arrive on goodwill missions to pay tribute and to show their national flags, there is nothing bad about it. This indicates that contacts are being established and mutual understanding. This can only be welcome. It is a different matter if this is a demonstration of force. However, I do not think that the recent visits to the Black Sea by ships of NATO countries were for that purpose.

[Prytula] Admiral, one last question: Rumors have recently been spreading in Sevastopol on a possible transfer of the main base of Ukraine's Naval Forces to Odessa....

[Bezkorovaynyy] These are, indeed, nothing but rumors, and they are groundless.

Fuel Market Problems Causing Power Cuts

PM0112154793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Dec 93 First Edition p 6

[Boris Sverdlov report under the general heading "Neighboring Countries": "Donetsk: On Starvation Power Rations"]

[Text] The power crisis, it seems, is driving Ukraine's already teetering economy right into a corner. The very real threat is looming that electrified railroad sections could be disconnected.

In the industrial sector of the Donbass an effective electricity-saving system is already operating. Energy-industry enterprises are being disconnected by turns. They include such giants as the "Azovstal" Metallurgical Combine named for Ilich, by-product coke plants, and coal-enrichment plants...

The current situation has forced power workers to embark on extreme measures. Fuel depots have been completely cleared out. Many electric power stations are working, as they say, from hand to mouth, dispatching coal to the furnace straight from incoming delivery cars.

Some coal associations, indignant at the extreme indifference to their problems on the part of authorities who owe hundreds of billions of karbovantsy, are showing their discontent by continuing to halt shipments. Others have decided to sell coal to anybody in a position to refund the prime cost of extraction. Such people have proved to be few. Ultimately all this has led to a situation where the mass disconnection of electric power to residential districts has begun.

There are no prospects whatever for power stations using fuel oil. There are no "pools" of this fuel to speak of, and the Donbass industrial sector does not have the funds to top up storage containers. In an effort to avoid halting production, the Lisichansk Oil Refining Combine,

Europe's largest, has been forced to send the lion's share of its output for export. The vast majority of state service stations have been closed down.

But here is something interesting. There is no shortage of gasoline on the highways. Traders can be found on virtually every intersection, selling direct. For half a million karbovantsy you can fill the tank of a Zhiguli right up to the top. Business, or rather speculation in the Donbass, Dnepropetrovsk, and Kharkov areas is booming thanks to the proximity of Russian service stations. All it takes is for Ukrainian dealers to cross the border to be immediately met by commercial gasoline tankers.

What lies ahead for Ukraine this winter? In the phraseology of deputies at the current Supreme Council session, God alone knows. The government has been tasked with setting up a procedure for consuming what fuel is left in reserve and with beginning a vigorous search for fuel in countries nearby and further afield as quickly as possible. Whether these well-meaning demands will be crowned with success is another question. After all, the main supplier is Russia, and it is also on starvation rations.

Statistics Ministry Discloses Foreign Trade Data

WS0212115993 Kiev Ukrayinske Radio First Program Network in Ukrainian 0900 GMT 2 Dec 93

[Text] According to a report by the Ministry of Statistics, Ukraine's total foreign trade turnover with countries of the former Soviet Union between January and October of this year amounted to 34.3 trillion karbovanetses [K]. Our exports totaled K11.2 trillion and imports amounted to K23.1 trillion. The K11.8-trillion trade deficit was basically caused by the import of natural gas, oil, and oil products. An active trade balance with these countries was achieved only in certain fields, such as rolled ferrous metals—K1.4 trillion; sugar—K0.9 trillion; steel pipes—K0.6 trillion; ferrous alloys—K0.3 trillion; as well as cars, trucks, meat, olive oil, and milk. Ukraine's trade deficit with Russia amounted to K9.7 trillion; with Turkmenistan—K2.1 trillion; with Belarus—K145 billion; with Lithuania—K290 billion; with Estonia—K16 billion; and with Kyrgyzstan—K2.2 billion.

Belarus

'Power Ministers' Criticize Army, Cadres Policy

PM0212101793 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 3

[Valeriy Kovalev report: "Which Cadres Decide Everything. Belarusian Power Ministers Have Turned to Parliament With Regard to Reforming the Army"]

[Text] Minsk—A letter which Eduard Shirkovskiy, KGB chairman in the Republic of Belarus, and Vladimir Yegorov, the republic's minister of internal affairs, sent to Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich and Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich has been distributed among deputies in the Belarusian parliament.

What was it that made the leaders of two power structures pick up their pens? In their opinion, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Belarus are being reformed too hastily. In particular, E. Shirkovskiy and V. Yegorov regard the creation of autonomous border guard troops, railroad troops, and civil defense troops as a "wrong decision" and propose to rectify that mistake—which will "significantly reduce the numbers of leadership personnel and preserve large material funds."

The power ministers also criticized the cadre policy in the Armed Forces. "Personal loyalty and the existence of close links in government circles are today becoming the decisive criterion when appointing people to posts," the letter states. "Four deputy ministers, all the armies' commanders, and their chiefs of staff have been replaced within just 18 months in the Ministry of Defense."

The KGB chairman and the minister of internal affairs also called strictly to account the activity of the Republic of Belarus Council of Ministers State Secretariat for Combatting Crime and for National Security and its leader G. Danilov, who constantly interferes in the cadre policies of all the power ministries.

It is not yet known whether the message from the leaders of the power departments will be submitted for discussion in parliament. But, if such a discussion does take place, it promises to be very stormy: The contents of the letter have been perceived unequivocally both in the Supreme Soviet and in government circles.

Supreme Soviet Official Reacts

WS0112143693 Minsk NARODNAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Nov 93 p 1

[Report by Sergey Plytkevich: "I Do Not Support State Officials Who Go In for Political Tricks"]

[Excerpt] This was how Mechislav Grib, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Commission for National Security Issues, assessed the letter of Belarusian KGB Chairman Eduard Shirkovskiy and Interior Minister Vladimir Yegorov to Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich and Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich.

Why was the chairman of a legislative commission, dealing with issues mentioned in the letter, so critical about the initiative of the power ministers? The reason is that according to Mechislav Grib and the absolute majority of members of his commission, it is senseless to change the Defense Ministry structure and to resubordinate civil defense to the Defense Ministry and the border troops to the KGB. Further, Mechislav Ivanovich has specified that these issues have possibly some grounding, however, they should be considered some other time. As for the state secretary for crime prevention and national security which is subordinated to the cabinet of ministers, it is up to the cabinet of ministers and the prime minister to decide the destiny of this organ, Mechislav Ivanovich Grib thinks. Vyacheslav Kebich has promised the Supreme Soviet to change the structure of the Council of Ministers, therefore, time is not a factor and it is better to wait for what Vyacheslav Frantsevich will decide on the issue. The Supreme Soviet Commission for National Security has not discussed the legal character of the state secretary for crime prevention and national security and has not assessed its activities. At the end of his speech, Mechislav Ivanovich asked the authors of this letter to excuse him, however, in his opinion, the structural changes of the Internal Ministry or the KGB do not concern the state system of Belarus. [passage omitted]

'Belarus' Faction Calls For Presidential Power

LD0112185193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1728 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin, edited by Boris Grishchenko: from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature]

[Text] On Tuesday the largest association of the Belarusian parliament—called Belarus, with more than 120 members—spoke in favor of the introduction of the institute of presidential power in the republic.

The text of the association's address to the country's citizens and deputy corps, and which was provided to Interfax, points out that the introduction of the presidential post in the republic is, in particular, a result of the necessity to reform the executive power system. "Introduction of a presidency will grant new status and greater possibilities to the hierarchy of executive power, which is an important premise and condition for improving the situation in the country. In addition," deputies from the association believe, "an elected strong president would ensure normal functioning of state management bodies and other state and public institutions during future elections to the Supreme Soviet and local councils."

"Belarus could face a great shock and the threat of falling into an abyss without a presidential republic. Today, a parliamentary republic is able to operate in Belarus because the under-development of the party system creates an unstable government formed by the parliament's unstable majority," Belarus members said. The

address especially stressed the necessity to hold presidential elections in the spring of 1994.

According to the estimates of several influential deputies, the draft of the country's Basic Law, agreed upon in principle, will be adopted before the end of this week.

Printing Branch Officials Issue Appeal

WS0212120693 Minsk RESPUBLIKA in Belarusian 30 Nov 93 p 3

["Text" of open letter of chief editors of central Belarusian printed media to the Belarusian Supreme Soviet and cabinet of ministers; date not given]

[Text] The current financial and economic situation in the branch connected with publishing newspapers and journals is so critical that the "Belarusian Printing House" and the periodicals that they print are on the verge of closing. Currently, the government's decision on payments for energy resources in Russian rubles has literally made printing trade workers and journalists bankrupt.

Everyone understands quite well to what results the halt of printing newspapers and journals can lead to. First of all, the absence of information editions will lead to:

1. Complete destabilization of the social situation in the Republic;

2. Downturn of the "image" of the Republic of Belarus on the international arena;

3. Collapse of the information system in Belarus.

We consider it necessary to discuss this extraordinary situation at the urgent joint session of the Presidium of the Belarusian Supreme Soviet, the cabinet of ministers, the editorial board of the "Belarusian Printing House," and representatives of the Belarusisn Union of Journalists of Belarus.

[Signed] B. Kutavy, general manager of "Belarusian Printing House"; L. Ekel, chairman of the Belarusian Union of Journalists of Belarus; A. Akulik, deputy chief editor of RESPUBLIKA; Ya. Alyakseychyk, general manager of BELINFORM press agency; I. Asinski, chief editor of SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA; S. Bukchyn, chief editor of EVROPEYSKOE VREMYA; U. Vyalichka, chief editor of BELARUSKAYA DUMKA; U. Narkevich, chief editor of ZVYAZDA; I. Syaredzich, chief editor of NARODNAYA GAZETA; S. Sverkunow, chief editor of VECHERNIY MINSK.

Moldova

Snegur Discusses Transdniester, Ukraine's Role

WS0212120993 Kiev KIEVSKIYE VEDOMOSTI in Russian 20 Nov 93 p 3

[Interview with Moldovan President Mircea Snegur by Aleksandr Ilchenko in Chisinau; date not given: "We Have Issues To Discuss With President Kravchuk"]

[Excerpt] [Ilchenko] Former Soviet states that once won independence and declared their sovereignty are currently seeking integration, cooperation, and restoration of disrupted economic ties. What is your vision of Ukrainian-Moldovan relations?

[Snegur] Moldova and Ukraine have long been good neighbors, living in peace and friendship and jointly fighting enemies. Fortunately, our people have managed to preserve these relations. Both history and world experience demonstrate the only possible way of development—that of friendship, accord, cultural and economic cooperation, and assisting each other in implementing reform that poses similar problems to both states.

[Ilchenko] Some observers believe that the so-called "instability line" stretches across Moldova. While visiting the Transdniester area, we heard opinions that emotions concerning this region are being stirred in Moscow rather than Tiraspol. How do you assess the nature of the conflict and ways to overcome it? What are the political, military, or other methods to neutralize the source of tension?

[Snegur] I would not say that emotions are being stirred in Moscow, although there are people in Russia inciting the conflict. The conflict is not of an international nature. It was aroused by a difference in views on choosing the path of further development. The Moldovan people have firmly embarked on the path of reforming their society and building an independent sovereign state, free from any ideology, especially a totalitarian one. Our state should be based on national traditions and guarantee equal rights to all its citizens. This path does not suit those who would prefer to restore the ideology reigning in the former USSR. This ideology was protected by Moscow putschists in 1991 and October 1993.

In the Transdniester area, this standpoint was primarily represented by party and economic apparatchiks. Their activities were used by certain politicians in Russia and resulted in attempts to force Moldova off the chosen path. Instead of resolving all the disputable issues through peaceful political means, separatists provoked an ordinary mutiny and armed resistance against lawful organs of power. Aggressive methods of resolving political issues have always led to bloodshed. Moldova was forcefully drawn into this conflict although it had done its best to avoid it.

The conflict can only be resolved politically. If Tiraspol leaders guarantee Transdniester residents the necessary conditions for participation in the upcoming elections for the Moldovan legislature, their representatives in this body might actively assist in finding the most suitable solution. However, ideas of making the Transdniester area an independent state with autonomous legislation, army, and security service and of forming a confederation with Moldova must be given up. With whom could we form a confederation? Moldovans constitute a

majority of left-bank residents. However, we believe that common sense will prevail in Tiraspol and the problem will be moved from its current stalemate position. We are ready for this.

[Ilchenko] The Russian Army is playing a peacekeeping role in the region. How long will this contingent remain on Moldovan territory?

[Snegur] The 14th Army is an implacable source of tension in the area. Ukrainians have experienced a similar situation, but not quite the same. In Moldova, 14th Army units participated in combat activities on rebels' side against legal authorities. President Yeltsin has been repeatedly declaring that the Army will be withdrawn from Moldova. We understand that this is not an easy task because there is no place for this Army in Russia either. We are ready to meet Russia halfway, but we urge that measures be taken without delay. The Army's position is far from passive. Without any grounds, it drafts Moldovan citizens, opens draft offices for hiring military contractors, and the Army commander is openly voicing his support for the nonexistent Transdniester Moldovan Republic. We have been sparing no effort to have the 14th Army withdrawn from our territory; we are suggesting solutions acceptable to both sides.

[Ilchenko] Do you believe that Ukraine could contribute more efficiently to the peace process in the region? How?

[Snegur] I wish Ukraine realized that it could contribute efficiently to the peace process in this area. However, it should be precisely stated what aims Ukraine is going to pursue in its activities—preserving Moldova's partition or restoring integrity. What would Ukrainian citizens say had they been asked this question? I am sure that there would be one answer—Ukraine must be inseparable.

Local conflicts would be resolved easier if Moldova and Ukraine, along with other neighboring states of the Black Sea or Danube regions, drafted a number of documents to safeguard peace in the region. We could jointly appeal to the United Nations to blueprint collective measures on fighting separatism and terrorism. We could jointly suggest Black Sea countries sign a charter on inviolability of borders and mutual commitments to refrain from territorial claims against one another. This would prevent all disputes and conflicts, including most local ones. [passage omitted]

Officials View First Round of Dniester Talks

LD0112220393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1827 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Demidestkiy]

[Text] Chisinau, December 1 TASS—The first round of talks on the settlement of the Dniester conflict carried out with Russia's mediation and which ended late on Tuesday showed that it was not easy to reach an agreement between Chisinau and Tiraspol because of differences between the sides.

Moldova's representative at the talks and chairman of a parliamentary commission, Nikolay Andronnik, said that the Dniester side had not signed a document proposed by Russian mediators which reflects fundamental principles of a dialogue started by the sides.

A representative from Tiraspol, Professor Vasiliy Yakovlev, told ITAR-TASS that the document was premature and in fact, envisaged the abolishment of the Dniester self-proclaimed republic. He said that it is necessary to bring the positions of the sides closer together, but to begin not from the division of powers, as the document envisages, but rather from the establishment of a coordination council which should consist of representatives from both banks of the Dniester river. The council should resolve vital problems which arose after last year's war.

Yakovlev pointed out that it would be possible to create a confederation, a federation and even a unitarian state only after Moldova's alienation was overcome. In his opinion, recommendations worked out by CSCE experts on the conflict settlement cannot serve as a basis for talks since they do not take into account the present-day realities.

Nikolay Medvedev, special representative of the Russian president, has a different opinion. Before departure from Chisinau he declared that he believes the CSCE recommendations to be a substantial basis for talks on working out the status of the Dniester region in the framework of integral Moldova. Alongside the Dniester status, it is necessary to resolve a number of current problems, gradually reduce peace-keeping forces in the region and develop economic cooperation, Medvedev said.

Gagauz Republic Dissolves Local Councils

LD0112161993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1425 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] President of the self-proclaimed Gagauz republic (in Moldova's south) Stepan Topal has issued a decree on reorganization of power bodies in the Gagauz republic. He ordered the activity of regional, city, and village councils of people's deputies to be endedthroughout the whole territory of the Gagauz republic and liquidate the deputies' authorities of these councils.

According to the decree, the president and Gagauzia's government head the activity of the regional executive committees in the future, and presidential envoys in the regions.

The document notes that the decree has been issued to preserve unity and integrity of the Gagauz republic, to bring it out of the economic and political crisis and to ensure state and public security.

The preamble to the presidential decree points out that the activity of regional executive committees and councils of people's deputies has gone beyond the control of the republic's leadership and does not meet realities of the present day or interests of Gagauzia's people.

In the opinion of local observers, the major aim of the decree is to prevent actions of several local self-management bodies which support policy of the official Chisinau. In particular, regardless of the decision of the Gagauz government several regional power bodies passed a decision to participate in the forthcoming elections to the Moldovan parliament.

Kazakhstan

Almaty Clarifies Position on Karabakh Conflict

NC0112212193 Yerevan Armenia's Radio First Program Network in Armenian 2000 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] As we have already reported, while presenting his credentials in Baku, Kazakhstan's Ambassador Ibrahim Amangaliyev declared that Kazakhstan cannot remain neutral in the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict.

Arman Melikyan, the Armenian charge d'affaires in Kazakhstan, met with Kazakh Foreign Minister Suleymenov in Almaty and requested an explanation of the ambassador's statement.

Explaining Kazakhstan's official position, Foreign Minister Suleymenov expressed concern over the ongoing conflict and noted that, in view of the protracted nature of the conflict, Kazakhstan cannot defend one of the sides. Kazakhstan's position is that a decision that satisfies all sides should be adopted. In addition, Kazakhstan does not object to Karabakh taking part in the talks and in the peace process as a side to the conflict.

With regard to Ambassador Amangaliyev's statement, an official present at the Baku meeting said that, when the ambassador made this statement, he was thinking of Kazakhstan's readiness to provide all possible assistance to establish of peace and to revive its role as a mediator if the sides accept it.

In the meantime, Amangaliyev, the Kazakh ambassador to Azerbaijan, issued a written clarification in which he said that, when he made the statement, he was taking into consideration the fact that Kazakhstan, as a member of the United Nations and the CSCE, cannot remain neutral in matters of principle or remain indifferent to human suffering and bloodshed. And, as a signatory of the Paris Charter, Kazakhstan is ready to continue its mediation efforts in line with internationally accepted norms.

Baykonur To Be Leased to Russia or International Firm

LD0112223293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2029 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Russia must take full responsibility for the Baykonur space center and the town of Leninsk, a senior Kazakhstan official thinks.

Minister of Science and New Technologies Galym Abilsiitov said at a news conference in Almaty Wednesday that Kazakhstan did not have its own space program and so the space center's existence was only to the benefit of the Russian program.

He also said that an international space company had to be set up which would draw on foreign capital and carry out various space projects. This, he noted, was the only way for the space center to be "rescued."

"If this option does not work, Kazakhstan is prepared to consider leasing the Baykonur space center and the town of Leninsk to Russia provided that Russia takes up all expenses," Abilsiitov said. In this case Kazakhstan will demand that its expenses over the last 36 months be covered, the minister said. He did not rule out the possibility of holding at tender for either purchasing or renting Baykonur.

Director General of the Russian Space Agency Yuriy Koptev, who attended the news conference, called for transferring some of Baykonur assets to the Russian Space Force until such time that an international space company is set up. Some assets could be transferred to the industry which would set up companies or joint stock societies to attract solid investors within two or three years. These companies could, Koptev thinks, use Proton boosters or the Mir space laboratory.

Koptev emphasized that Baykonur should also be used for Russian military space programs.

The Kazakh minister responded by saying that the Russian intention to maintain a military presence in Baykonur did not help resolve the problem of the space center.

Letter Circulated Protesting Zhirinovskiy Remarks

PM3011093193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 93 First Edition p 4

[Vladimir Ardeyev report: "Zhirinovskiy Had Better Not Travel to Kazakhstan"]

[Text] Almaty—According to KAZTAG news agency reports, several public organizations and national-cultural centers in Kazakhstan's capital have circulated a statement, addressed to the Russian Government, in connection with outspoken statements by the leader of the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia. They believe that V. Zhirinovskiy's speech on the airwaves is aimed at fanning interetnnic dissension on the territory of the former USSR, and note that Zhirinovskiy, exploiting the facilities made available to candidate deputies, is making territorial claims against neighboring independent states on his party's behalf. The authors express regret that Russia's leadership is freely allowing the mass media to widely disseminate appeals and slogans which foment ethnic and racial hatred, and express their protest in this connection. A separate statement has also been adopted by the People's Unity of Kazakhstan Union Presidium.

In its own statement, Kazakhstan's Foreign Ministry also expresses belief that the fanning of interethnic dissension at any level is equally harmful to both Kazakhstan and Russia.

Deputies Urge Supreme Soviet, Local Elections

LD3011092893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0815 GMT 30 Nov 93

[Text] Almaty November 30 TASS—A group of people's deputies, members of the presidium of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet Orazaliy Sabdenov, Byrganym Aitinov, and Bulat Djanasayev have published in the republican newspaper "KAZAKHSKAYA PRAVDA" a proposal to "include in the agenda of the second part of the regular session of the Kazakh parliament, scheduled for December, the discussion of a bill on elections to the Supreme Soviet and local government bodies, and to announce new elections to the soviets of all ranks after its adoption. The session, if it adopts the bill, is to be declared the last session of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet of the 12th convocation".

It is quite possible that the work of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet of the current convocation will be ended already in the first half of this December. Local analysts have good reasons to predict such an outcome. The process of the self-dissolution of the soviets (councils), the beginning for which was laid by the decisions adopted by some district soviets of Almaty, the Kazakh capital, was in the focus of Kazakh public opinion over the past six months. This process, according to reports coming in from the regions, has now become irreversible. About one hundred soviets of various ranks, including the Almaty city and regional soviets, have already self-dissolved. These resolute steps by people's deputies are explained by the narrow limits of absolutely outlived laws, governing the work of the representative system, and by the inability of the Soviets to implement the will of their electors in these conditions.

The deputies, who published the foregoing proposal in the "KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA" today, advance equally grounded arguments in favour of putting an end to the work of the Supreme Soviet and electing a new professional parliament. In their opinion, "many questions are awaiting urgent solution in the rapidly changing situation and they cannot wait for the sessions of the Supreme Soviet, which meets only twice a year. It is high time to form a permanently working parliament in order to keep abreast of, if not forestall, the ongoing socio-economic processes by the timely amendment of the legislation". Moreover, they believe, the parliament, elected for the first time on a democratic basis, will contribute to stability in the Kazakh society, to the strengthening of the state's authority on the international arena, and, acting according to new laws in the new conditions, will fully justify the hopes of its electors.

Kyrgyzstan

Akayev Decrees 30 Jan Referendum on President

LD3011200293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1614 GMT 30 Nov 93

[From the "Presidential Bulletin" feature by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovsky, and Vladimir Shishlin, edited by Boris Grishchenko]

[Text] President Askar Akayev has decreed holding a referendum on January 30 on confidence in himself.

He explained his decision by the need to regain stability, improve the political climate and reveal the nature of popular sentiment.

The question put for the referendum reads: "Do you confirm that the President of Kyrgyzstan, democratically elected on October 12, 1991, for five years is president of the Kyrgyz republic with the right to act as head of state during his term of office"?

Akayev is to address the nation at 21:00 today to clarify his position.

A copy of his statement, received by Interfax, says that growing instability may worsen the nation's economy and aggravate many social and economic problems.

Akayev said his decree was necessary because after the passage of the constitution neither he nor parliament have had legitimate powers. Besides, many movements and parties have been increasingly critical of him lately.

Since he disagreed with that, he made up his mind to call a referendum. He believes that regardless of the referendum results, they will still help to stabilize the situation. He emphasized that in his decision he was guided by democratic principles.

Tajikistan

Authorities, Opposition To Hold 'Constructive' Talks

LD3011195393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1706 GMT 30 Nov 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Galina Gridneva]

[Text] Dushanbe November 30 TASS—"We will carry on a constructive dialogue with all opposition parties and movements, which are ready for cooperation with the country's leadership with a view to achieve civil accord and pull the republic out of the grave economic crisis", first deputy chairman of the Tajik parliament Abdumadzhid Dostiyev said today on completion of the first meeting of the parliamentary commission for coordination with public organizations.

According to Dostiyev, the commission intends to establish closer contacts with public associations both in Tajikistan and outside it. To address these issues, working groups vested with wide powers have been set up. They are entitled to conduct, on behalf of the republic's leadership, negotiations with opposition representatives in former Soviet republics and foreign countries, to explain the republic's official policy to Tajik refugees staying off the country and to help them return to their homes.

Badakhshan Leader Welcomes Aid, Rejects 'Islamic State'

PM0112173593 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 3

[Interview with G.Sh. Shabozov, chairman of Gorno-Badakhshan Oblast Soviet, by Anatoliy Ladin in Khorog, date not given: "Gorno-Badakhshan Does Not Want War"—first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] In conversation with Garibsho Shabozov, chairman of Gorno-Badakhshan Oblast Soviet, our correspondent endeavored to touch on those questions which are most urgent for this region of Tajikistan today.

[Ladin] Esteemed Garibsho Shabozovich, Gorno-Badakhshan is not yet rid of armed confrontation. And yet are there any changes for the better?

[Shabozov] There certainly are. I recently returned from a tour of the oblast's rayons, and I will say that this time I encountered no armed men in the villages, as was the case before. The general situation has improved noticeably everywhere, including Khorog itself. I am far from thinking, however, that everything has already been put right. As in other regions of Tajikistan, the situation here remains complex. There are still people in the oblast who support the former government. They are only a few dozen, but they exist. They have a link with the opposition leadership, now in Afghanistan.

I would like to point out that the absolute majority of the population of Gorno-Badakhshan (I would say 99 percent) is in favor of our land's remaining part of Tajikistan. I cannot understand the groundless allegations by certain mass media that the population of Gorno-Badakhshan is seeking to secede from the Republic of Tajikistan. This has not been and is not the case.

This is where the rumors stemmed from: On 9 December 1991 a session of the oblast soviet adopted a decision to transform the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast into an autonomous republic. There were numerous rallies in support of that process. But that decision can be valid only once approved by the Tajikistan Supreme Council.

[Ladin] People today are talking about the assistance given to you by the Aga Khan Foundation, set up by the spiritual leader of all the world's Ismailis. In this connection, can the Imam Aga Khan's present attention to the oblast's problems influence the political situation in Gorno-Badakhshan?

[Shabozov] I am asked this question quite frequently. If you mean by it that we have somehow changed our attitude to our people's future and are going to set about creating an Islamic state, then that view is wrong. The people do not support the idea of creating such a state.

Any assistance, however, is a temporary phenomenon. We must not rely on it alone. Our land is rich in natural resources. There are gold, rubies, noble spinel, lazurite, and other valuable minerals beneath the surface of Gorno-Badakhshan, and there are several dozen sources of mineral water of the "Narzan" type. We are ready to cooperate with any states, above all with Russia and the CIS countries. I would like for Gorno-Badakhshan to develop industrially and new jobs to be created. And for our land not to remain just a raw materials base.

Turkmenistan

Atayev Resigns Over Niyazov Lifetime Presidency Plan

MK0112074093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 85, 30 Nov 93 (Signed to press 29 Nov) p 4

[Mekhman Gafarly report under the "Presidents" rubric: "There Will Be No Rule Better Than Niyazov's, Turkmenistan's Communists Think]

[Text] The recent plenum of the oblast organization of the Democratic Party of Turkmenistan (the republic's former Communist Party) held in Tashauz the other day proposed to extend the constitutional term of office for Saparmurad Niyazov as the country's president from 5 to 10 years. Under the current republic's constitution, a citizen of Turkmenistan has the right to be elected president for not more than two consecutive terms of five years.

The Turkmen "democrats" raised the question, during their plenum, about making Saparmurad Niyazov the republic's president for life. Turkmenistan Foreign Minister Khalykberdy Atayev has resigned in protest. Mr. Atayev stated that Niyazov, who had declared himself Turkmenbashi—leader of Turkmen the world over—concentrated in his hands powers which even medieval despots did not wield. The former head of the Turkmen Ministry for Foreign Affairs thinks that Niyazov is destroying the glimmer of democracy in the country. Many squares, streets, and population centers bear Niyazov's name, while his image is sported on the Turkmen currency, the manat.

Uzbekistan

Ukrainian Ambassador Discusses Bilateral Issues

LD3011201693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1614 GMT 30 Nov 93

["Text" of "exclusive" interview with Ukrainian ambassador to Tashkent Vladimir Smetanin by unidentified INTERFAX correspondents in Tashkent; date not given; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko]

[Text] IF [INTERFAX]: What do you make of the recent initialling of next year's trade and economic agreement between Uzbekistan and Ukraine?

SMETANIN: The volume of next year's bilateral trade runs at $391 Mn. The two countries had agreed on a balanced trade at world prices and in U.S. dollars removing all trade barriers against each other.

Our relationship is based on the outline friendship and cooperation agreement that Ukraine and Uzbekistan had signed after winning their independence two years ago. Ukraine had the honor of hosting President Islam Karimov. Understanding was reached about the need for common economic area including customs, transport, scientific and cultural links. Agreement was also reached between the two countries' interior and security ministries to combat crime and drug-trafficking which have no borders. Nor does the CIS as a whole seem to have them either.

IF: For the time being perhaps?

SMETANIN: In my view, the absence of borders is not normal because the country's strength is also measured by its borders.

To go back to our agreements. It is widely believed that Uzbekistan depends on Ukraine for its sugar imports and we need Uzbek cotton. But the range of bilateral trade is wider than that. Uzbekistan is not self-sufficient for food yet. By contrast, Ukraine is and can become a net food exporter. It also has a healthy engineering sector and oil refining capacities. No wonder the two countries are keen to set up joint ventures to develop Uzbekistan's oil and gas industry with the help of Ukrainian investments. We believe we are capable of building a good partnership without any pressure from the outside though there are some who still want to try to apply it.

IF: Compared to this year's trade volume of $191 Mn [million], the two countries look set to double it in 1994. How are they going to boost bilateral trade after failing to meet even this year's target figures?

SMETANIN: True. But there are reasons to explain that. The old crediting and financial system was overhauled soon after Ukraine won independence. Ukraine was also the first to leave the ruble zone. So, we had to introduce the interim currency, the coupon, as Uzbekistan was forced to recently.

IF: But Ukraine and Uzbekistan are both independent now but, nonetheless, the problem of defaults remains.

SMETANIN: The trouble is we still disagree on how to convert each other's currencies. Initially, we thought about tying them up with the ruble, but this appeared to be unstable. Both countries now try to increase output to achieve economic independence which will eventually help resolve the issue. In the meantime, agreement was reached on account-settling in dollars. An interstate bank can also help resolve the problem of account-clearing. Ukraine, Belarus and Central Asian states can easily struck rapport on this but without any pressure from the outside. I would like to emphasize that Ukraine is seeking greater integration rather than self-isolation. Experts on both sides have been working hard to try to sort out the problem of mutual supplies. In the next few days, Tashkent and Kiev are expected to initial and ratify a formal agreement on interbank account-clearing.

IF: Is Ukraine going to do anything about the fate of 154,000 ethnic Ukrainians residing in Uzbekistan?

SMETANIN: As far as I am concerned, the problem is non-existent. Uzbekistan's legislation is completely in line with international laws and there is not a single local law encroaching on human rights. I recently meet a group of Ukrainian war-veterans who were evacuated to Uzbekistan during WW II. None of them spoke of being discriminated or wanting to go back home. They appear to have settled here for good.

IF: And yet, there are some who would like to return. Will they have a chance to do so?

SMETANIN: Of course, there are those who suffer from nostalgia and would like to end their days in Ukraine. We have a consular department in Tashkent and Ukrainian citizenship can be granted to those who were born or have relatives in Ukraine. However, dual citizenship is out of question.

IF: However, local Ukrainians may feel severed from their homeland, culture and language...

SMETANIN: We are trying to examine the problem. But the trouble is local Ukrainians do not live together having merged with the Russian-speaking community here. To begin with, it must be decided whether there is a need for Ukrainian-language schools or classes here at all. In the meantime, plans are in progress to set up a Ukrainian information and cultural center in Tashkent. I hope it will open next year to help resolve the problem of information exchange between the two countries. Ukraine and Uzbekistan must know each other better but without any third party's diktat.

I would like to take this opportunity to say that I like President Karimov's policies. He managed to separate politics from the economy, promote good relations and trading contacts with other CIS states and maintain internal stability.

Armenia

Russian Envoy Kazimirov Returns to Yerevan

NC0112200693 Yerevan SNARK in English 1323 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Yerevan, December 1 (SNARK)—According to SNARK's information, Russian Plenipotentiary and Extraordinary Ambassador to Armenia has returned to Yerevan.

'The accident with Russian President's Extraordinary Envoy Vladimir Kazimirov can be settled by normal commonly accepted means', said Armenian First Deputy Foreign Minister Zhirair Liparityan.

'We are going on with constructive contacts with Russian Foreign Ministry', added the Deputy Minister.

Tension Reportedly Increasing on Karabakh Borders

NC0112180593 Yerevan Radio Yerevan in Azeri 1430 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Dear listeners, we now present a report on the latest situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic [NKR] and the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Tension has considerably escalated on the NKR front lines as a result of Azerbaijan's rejection of the CSCE's new calendar. The number of combat operations has increased. As reported earlier, the enemy side has not been satisfied with positional fighting. Consequently, it has moved to launched wide-scale attacks. The Armenian side has obstructed Azerbaijan's onslaughts. Azerbaijan's military units have been forced to retreat after suffering many casualties.

The NKR Defense Headquarters has disclosed that Azerbaijan's military units pounded the Armenian defense positions in Martuninskiy and Fizulinskiy Rayons with tanks, infantry combat vehicles, and artillery units on the night of 29 November and yesterday morning. The first reports said that several Armenian troops were wounded. However, the NKR's military forces refrained from retaliating. Obviously, Azerbaijan wishes to force the Armenians to retaliate.

Several sources have said that the Azerbaijan National Army is preparing to launch wide-scale attacks. The enemy has deployed many units and armored vehicles in various areas close to the NKR's front lines. In fact, the deployment of reinforcements was maintained today.

The situation on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan has been relatively peaceful.

Azerbaijan

Georgian Prime Minister Arrives on Visit

NC0112210993 Baku Azerbaycan Radio Televiziyasi Television Network in Azeri 1600 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] A Georgian delegation led by Prime Minister Otar Patsatsia began an official visit to our Republic toady.

Azerbaijan's Deputy Prime Minister Abbas Abbasov, Minister of Culture Polad Byul-Byul Ogly, and other officials welcomed the esteemed guests at Baku's Bina airport.

Azerbaijani President Geydar Aliyev received Georgian Prime Minister Otar Patsatsia today. Geydar Aliyev noted the importance of the talks on a joint solution to the problems Azerbaijan and Georgia are facing under their present grave circumstances. Such visits will help improve our relations.

Progress in implementing the high-level agreements between the two countries was discussed during the meeting, and views were exchanged on the possibility of Azerbaijan helping with fuel and tankers to solve the difficulties Georgia is facing this winter.

Rasul Guliyev, chairman of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, and Prime Minister Suret Guseynov also received the Georgian prime minister today. The prospects of improving the relations between the two friendly countries and the situation of the Azerbaijanis living in Georgia were reviewed during the meeting.

Official Urges Increased Russian Role in Peace Process

LD0112231693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2029 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Rakhman Mustafa-Zadeh of the Azerbaijan president's press service said that the non-constructive posture of Armenia was the largest obstacle to the CSCE peace process in the region.

Direct involvement of Armenia in the Karabakh conflict had a legal as well as a military and a political dimension, he emphasized in an interview with Interfax. As long as it has not repealed its constitutional and legal acts in which Nagorno-Karabakh is regarded as part of Armenia, official Yerevan cannot be a serious partner in the negotiating process, Mustafa-Zadeh said.

He made it clear that Moscow can and must play a more active part in resolving the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict. He said that Baku recognized the status of Russia as a great power having special interests in the Transcaucasian region.

It is Armenia, he thinks, that obstructs constructive interaction of Russia and Azerbaijan in resolving the Karabakh crisis.

Official on Ways To Settle Karabakh Issue

LD2511183593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1259 GMT 25 Nov 93

[Interview with Vafa Guluzade, adviser on international matters, by Elchin Khalilov; place and date not given; from "Exclusive" feature—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] In its previous issue, Interfax-Exclusive presented the viewpoint of the political leadership of Nagorno-Karabakh on the situation in the region and ways to settle the crisis. As promised, today we offer an opinion by the Azeri side. Vafa Guluzade, the republic's adviser on international matters, speaks with Interfax's Elchin Khalilov.

IF [INTERFAX]: You headed the Azeri delegation at the meeting of the CSCE Minsk group in Vienna on the settlement of the Azeri-Armenian conflict. What do you think about the results of the recent round of talks?

GULUZADE: First of all, I would like to note the importance of the UN Security Council's recent resolution denouncing the Armenian occupation of the Zangelan region and the Azeri town of Goradiz. The document also mentions the need for urgent relief aid to the population. The UN Security Council re-affirmed the republic's territorial integrity and the fact that Nagorno-Karabakh belongs to Azerbaijan.

As to the Vienna talks, a number of problems important to Azerbaijan were considered. First of all was the question of the liberation of the Zangelan region and the town of Goradiz. Discussions on this continued all day long. Following the discussions, the Minsk Group of Nine issued a corresponding statement. (Among the Group members are Germany, the United States, Belarus, France, Italy, Russia, Sweden, Czechia, and Turkey—IF).

IF: Has the Azeri stand changed somewhat?

GULUZADE: Azerbaijan has not deviated from its principle position, which is based on international law. Today one-fourth of the republic's territory is occupied by Armenian troops. That is why we demand complete liberation of all occupied lands. These must be liberated before the opening of the Minsk conference. We insisted that this position be reflected in the new version of the schedule of urgent measures.

IF: What objections does Baku have to this schedule?

GULUZADE: The Azeri delegation insisted that measures to liberate the Azeri towns of Shusha and Lachin during the period set be included in the schedule. For its part, Armenia demands that Azerbaijan surrender the Geranboisky region. However, the demand is groundless, since it is a question of Azeri lands, of the sovereign Republic of Azerbaijan.

The new document to be presented for consideration by the conflicting sides will, hopefully, solve the problem associated with the return of all Azeri refugees to their permanent homes. Lachin is an Azeri town and it must be liberated. Shusha is an Azeri town and it must also be liberated. As many as 60,000 Azeri residents of Shusha must return to their homes. We believe we can no longer agree to compromises in this respect. We will not sign the schedule unless our demands are introduced into it.

IF: How does the new schedule differ from the previous one?

GULUZADE: At the meeting in Vienna, the Azeri delegation circulated its version of the schedule through the Minsk Group Secretariat. While introducing changes into the document the Minsk Group of Nine, we believe, must proceed from the balance of interests of both sides. The new schedule does not have to indicate a deadline for Armenian troop withdrawal from Shusha and Lachin. However, the document will contain the demand to liberate these towns. This circumstance must be seen as a certain amount of progress compared with the Paris version of the schedule. The new version emphasizes the need to liberate Kubatly, Fizuli, Agdam, Djebrail, Kelbadjar, and Zangelan from Armenian occupation forces before the Minsk conference is convened.

The schedule is not yet ready: there is only a general package of proposals. Negotiations still continue. The draft schedule is expected to be sent to Baku. After we analyze it, we will determine our final position. (When this interview was already prepared for publication, it became known that Azerbaijan did not agree to the new version worked out by the Minsk Group. Azerbaijan explains its refusal by the fact that the document lacks the Azeri demands that Armenia should liberate the territories it occupied before the Minsk conference opened. Armenia did back the new version.—IF)

IF: Is the refugee problem reflected in the document?

GULUZADE: Armenia demands that the problem of refugees not be linked to unblocking of communications. Baku, however, believes that the unblocking should be linked to the problems associated with the liberation of the occupied lands and the return of refugees on the basis of international norms and principles of the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe.

IF: Are there grounds to the assertion that at the Vienna meeting Nagorno-Karabakh was recognized as a conflicting party?

GULUZADE: The Armenian community of Nagorno-Karabakh was not recognized by the CSCE as an independent party of the conflict. The attempts to receive such status by the Karabakh Armenian representative were curbed by the Russian special envoy Kazimirov. I want to point out that every nation may determine itself only once. Therefore, speculation concerning the self-determination of the Karabakh Armenians lacks logic. The Armenian people determined themselves on the territory of the Armenian Republic and have their own state—the Republic of Armenia.

Armenian propaganda uses the thesis of a national-liberation war. However, the current war is not being waged by Karabakh Armenians. The 100,000-strong population of the mountain region, with an agricultural economy, cannot wage a successful war against a seven-million-strong industrialized country.

IF: Does the CSCE have a real mechanism to ensure peace in the zone of the Armenian-Azeri conflict?

GULUZADE: In the CSCE lobby, people are discussing the deployment of Russian troops as peace-keepers in the zone of conflict. They could be stationed along the cease-fire line. The CSCE believes that in this step it is first necessary to achieve a lasting cease- fire. The Council, however, has not decided on the way to implement it.

The meeting of the Council of the CSCE Foreign Ministers will take place in Rome at the end of November, and will likely include discussion of granting peace-keeping status to Russian troops. The CSCE seems to show a positive attitude to this.

Karabakh Welcomes Iran's Mediation Efforts

LD0112202293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1733 GMT 1 Dec 93

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature by diplomatic correspondents Dmitriy Vosboynikov, Igor Porshnev, Vitaliy Trubetskoy, and others]

[Text] The leadership of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic has always stood for the non-violent settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and welcomes the attempts of international organizations to restore peace in the region as soon as possible, said Nagorno-Karabakh's foreign minister.

Arkadiy Gukasiyan told a news briefing in Stepanakert, capital of the enclave, that the mediatory efforts by Iran were very welcome. "It would be unreasonable to ignore Iran's efforts at mediation, because the Azerbaijani-Nagorno-Karabakh front is close to the Iranian border. The historical aspect of the matter is also quite important: at one time those territories were part of Persia," he said.

He expressed the hope that hostilities near the Azerbaijani-Iranian border would be avoided, for "they would have disastrous consequences, and not only for this region."

Ex-President Terms Removal From Power 'Unlawful'

MK0112153093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Dec 93 p 3

[Unattributed report under the "NEGA Reports" column]

[Text] Azerbaijan ex-President Ayaz Mutalibov held a news conference in the House of the Russian Press in Moscow on 30 November where he detailed his stands regarding the present political situation in the republic.

According to the ex-president, there are many instances of human rights violations on the part of today's leaders of the republic. In particular, some opponents of the ruling regime have been arrested and become political prisoners. Ayaz Mutalibov came out against amendments to the law on the press that call for the abridgement of press freedom. Azerbaijan's ex-president stressed that his removal from the position of head of state in the spring of 1992 was unlawful. Ayaz Mutalibov is known to have been elected Azerbaijan's first president as a result of the nationwide voting in September 1991, only having to announce his resignation in March 1992 in the wake of the tragedy in Khodzhaly. Having come to power for a second time on 14 May 1992, Mutalibov had to leave the capital of Azerbaijan the next day after the start of an armed revolt by the National Front.

Gasanov Links Pipeline Project to Karabakh Solution

NC0112183893 London Kanal-6 Television in Turkish 1700 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] The channeling of Azerbaijani petroleum to the world markets via a pipeline across Turkey continues to be just a plan. The Aliyev administration has linked the pipeline project to the solution of the Karabakh problem.

The essence of the policy, which was announced to the ANATOLIA NEWS AGENCY in Rome by Azerbaijani Foreign Minister Gasan Gasanov, is: The pipeline will cross the country that solves the Karabakh problem. Indicating that they are giving military support against the Armenian occupation [sentence as received], Gasan Gasanov added: The pipeline will cross the country that supports us and solves the Karabakh problem.

Observers indicate that Gasanov's statement is an open message to Russia and Turkey.

President Aliyev Appoints New Rayon Chiefs

NC0112214593 Baku Azerbaycan Radio Televiziyasi Television Network in Azeri 1600 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] In accordance with a decree signed by the Azerbaijani president, Nizami Kafar ogly Aliyev has been appointed head of the Dashkesanskiy Rayon Executive Administration, and Elchin Sahib ogly Bahtiyarov has been removed from this post.

Vilayet Yusuf ogly Mamedov has been appointed head of Ganja's Nizami Rayon Executive Administration, and Elvan Medat ogly Aliyev has been removed from this post.

Vagif Chihangir ogly Verdiyev has been appointed head of Ganja's Kepez Rayon Executive Administration, and Yelmar Yehya Ogly has been removed from this post.

Georgia

Tbilisi, Abkhazia Sign Memorandum of Understanding

LD0112205493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2017 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Konstantin Pribytkov]

[Text] Geneva December 1 TASS—The Georgian and Abkhazian delegations signed a memorandum of understanding in Geneva on Wednesday.

The memorandum outlines top-priority measures to be taken to settle the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict. The document urges the sides to refrain from using force during negotiations, exchange prisoners of war in accordance with the principle "all for all" and take measures to solve the problem of refugees.

It has been agreed to set up a group of experts to work out proposals on Abkhazia's political status. The group which will include representatives of Georgia, Abkhazia, Russia, the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) will begin working in Moscow this month.

The memorandum was signed by Georgian Parliament member Jaba Ioseliani who heads the Georgian delegation to the talks, First Deputy Abkhazian Parliament Chairman Sokrat Dzhindzholia, head of the Abkhazian delegation, U.N. special representative Edouard Brunner, Russian Deputy Foreign minister Boris Pastukhov and CSCE representative Vincenzo Manno.

The sides believe the United Nations should send more international observers to the region, which would promote the peace process. In a goodwill gesture, Georgia and Abkhazia will exchange all prisoners of war on December 20, 1993 without any conditions. Measures will be taken to find those missing and rebury the victims of the war.

The sides have also pledged to create conditions for voluntary, safe and prompt return of refugees to the places of their permanent residence in all districts of Abkhazia.

The Georgian and Abkhazian delegations called on the world community to help restore life-support systems in the war zone and provide humanitarian aid to those who need it most.

The sides agreed to hold their next round of talks in Moscow or Geneva on January 11, 1994.

"The first, extremely important step has been taken towards reaching large-scale settlement in Abkhazia," Pastukhov said. He asked the United Nations to circulate the memorandum as its official document. This would lend "new positive dynamics to Abkhazian settlement," he added.

"We are satisfied with the results of the talks and believe that despite all difficulties we have achieved the major—the delegations, with the mediation of the U.N. and Russia, have signed a very important document, whose main meaning lies in the sides' obligation not to use force," Pastukhov said.

The head of the Georgian delegation, Ioseliani, has also given a positive assessment to the document. "For the beginning, this is a big step. Much has been envisaged for the future," he said.

"We are realists and have reached during the first round of talks what we could. We hope these steps will be continued and we will reach large-scale settlement," Dzhindzholia said.

Brunner praised cooperation between the U.N. and Russia, which he described as excellent. The cooperation was very organic and open, he added. This hand-in-hand interaction may serve as a model for settling other crisis situations, Brunner said.

Seven Killed in Abkhaz Shelling of Villages

LD0112135093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1246 GMT 1 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi December 1 TASS—At least seven people have been killed and more than a dozen wounded as a result of Abkhazian troops' shelling of the villages Lata and Ajara in the highland Svanetia, mountainous region in Abkhazia predominantly inhabited by Georgians.

Since November 25, local militants have been resisting to the attacks of Abkhazians backed by artillery and "Grad" rocket launchers. The two settlements are situated high in the mountains and control a strategic road.

According to some Tbilisi-based observers, Georgia avoids to intervene supposedly pinning hope on the U.N. and Russia mediated Abkhaz-Georgian first face-to-face talks which started on Tuesday in Geneva.

However, concentration of Georgian manpower and military equipment and stockpiling of ammunition are being reported from the areas ajacent to the fighting zone.

Several days ago Georgian parlamentarian Boris Kukubava stated that a special expeditionary corps had been already set up from among the Abkhazian refugees. It is "destined to liberate the motherland", he said.

The observers do not exclude a large scale Georgian military operation in case the Geneva talks fail.

Tbilisi Assails Abkhaz 'Armed Intervention'

LD0112173193 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1900 GMT 30 Nov 93

["Statement by the Georgian head of state's press secretariat"]

[Text] An armed intervention recently unleashed by Abkhaz extremist forces, accompanied by boundless terrorism and banditry, still continues. Now, an unprecedented military development is taking place in mountain villages of Gulripshi rayon of the Abkhazian Autonomous Republic, where civilians have become victims of renewed aggression and have experienced brutal treatment characteristic of Gudauta extremists.

In fact, the point is that the leadership of the Abkhaz side does not reject a policy of territorial banditry but aspires to exile the Georgian population from Abkhazia. They do not disdain brutal treatment, mass killings and looting, and extermination of civilians who as usual include women, the elderly, and children.

A number of reports made public by Russian and other foreign mass media confirm these facts. It must be pointed out that the aggression is carried out in areas that are almost completely isolated from the outside world due to their geographic or natural conditions and where there are neither strategic sites nor objects of primary importance. However, in spite of all this the Abkhaz bandit units are again hastily concentrating their forces with the aim of developing their intervention.

This new unrestricted military campaign has been unleashed before the Geneva talks on the peaceful settlement of the Abkhazian conflict, and is apparently aimed at causing the dialogue to fail and then, by falsifying facts, blaming the Georgian side for the failure. At the most critical moments of the Abkhazian conflict the international community was convinced many times that political and military groups of Gudauta did not want and were not able to react to constructive resolutions.

A treacherous violation of the Sochi cease-fire agreement led to the UN Security Council passing several important resolutions. The attention of the Abkhaz side was drawn to the inadmissibility of the violation of norms of international law, especially if it is committed regularly and brazenly; however, the facts show that the current leadership of Abkhazia has no wish to listen to reason. With its provocative and irresponsible activities, it not only impudently ignores the UN peace efforts but also significantly reduces their efficiency as well as the constructive role of Russia, which took upon itself obligations of a guarantor and a mediator in the peaceful settlement of the conflict.

The Georgian head of state's press secretariat, which is authorized to draw the attention of international organizations as well as that of the Russian Government, voices its categorical protest against the hideous threats to the lives of the civilian population of Georgia by gangs of separatists, and expresses the hope that this new wave of brutal activities of the reactionary political criminals will be given an appropriate appraisal by the civilized world. This act of vandalism deserves to be exposed as yet another crime committed against humanity and to be condemned accordingly.

Tbilisi, Abkhazia Exchange 'Intervention' Charges

LD0112232093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2029 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] The Abkhazian Defense Ministry possesses information concerning several dates when Georgia possibly carried out intervention in Abkhazia, a source in the ministry told INTERFAX. December 14 was named as one of the most probable dates [sentence as received].

Defense Minister Sultan Sosnaliyev said the situation on the border river of Inguri was seriously aggravated. Over three days, Georgian terrorist actions left 5 Abkhazian servicemen dead, another 4 wounded and 5 missing, he said.

Meanwhile, Georgian leader Eduard Shevardnadze's press office accused Sukhumi of armed intervention against civilians of highland villages of the Gulripsh district aimed at ousting ethnic Georgians out of Abkhazia.

The Georgian press office's statement published today asserted that "the military campaign was unleashed on the eve of the Geneva Talks on peaceful settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia and was most probably designed to disrupt the dialogue."

Shevardnadze Holds Talks With Ajarian Leader

LD0112145293 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1400 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Excerpt] Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of the Georgian parliament and head of state, visited Ajaria today. The honored guest was met at Batumi airport by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ajaria, Aslan Abashidze, and senior officials from the leadership and government of the autonomous republic.

The purpose of my visit is to meet friends and examine pressing issues, Eduard Shevardnadze told journalists at the airport. Secondly, as far as I know, an interesting and important event has taken place here—an opera theatre has been inaugurated. I believe that the fact that people are thinking about great art at this time of trouble is a sign of immortality and that the country will be saved.

Shevardnadze and Abashidze left the airport for the headquarters of a Russian military division stationed in Ajaria. Talks were held behind closed doors with the division command. Journalists were not present at the talks. [passage omitted]

Leaders Meet Russian Commanders

LD0112202993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1930 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] Tbilisi December 1 TASS—Georgian leader Eduard Shevardnadze and Ajaria's Parliament Chairman Aslan Abashidze met with the commanders of the Russian division stationed in Batumi, capital of Ajaria, on Wednesday.

The sides discussed a new agreement between Russia and Georgia to determine the status of Russian troops in Georgia. They gave a positive assessment to their role in restoring peace and stability in western Georgia.

The Russian Army has agreed to help Georgian authorities to restore order and provide other support to the people of the Georgian port city of Poti, following the withdrawal of Black Sea Fleet ships from there.

They will be replaced by Georgian coastal guards who will take over the protection of the area.

All the ships currently staying near Adler because of bad weather conditions will soon head for Sevastopol, where the main base of the fleet is located, Andrey Labeznikov, Black Sea Fleet spokesman, told ITAR-TASS via telephone.

Shevardnadze Hails Russian Role

LD0212123893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1137 GMT 2 Dec 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tengiz Dzhibuti]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Dec—Eduard Shevardnadze has highly evaluated the role being played by Russian servicemen in the stabilization of the situation in western Georgia. On Wednesday he had a meeting in Batumi with the commanders, officers, and men of the Russian army division stationed in Ajaria. The Georgian head of state praised the speedy decision by the Russian armed forces command to assist the people of Poti in tightening law and order and guarding the port, which is extremely important to the republic.

An ITAR-TASS correspondent was informed today by the press center of the chairman of the Georgian parliament that during his meeting with the military Eduard Shevardnadze pointed to the marked improvement in relations between Russia and Georgia. Shevardnadze stressed that the new Russo-Georgian treaty clearly defines the status of the Russian armed forces stationed in Georgia.

Black Sea Fleet Ships Withdraw From Poti

LD0112202593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1829 GMT 1 Dec 93

[by UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Mikhail Stetsyuk]

[Text] Sevastopol, 1 Dec—All the forces of the Black Sea Fleet which had been in the region of the Georgian coastline and in Poti on a peacemaking mission were withdrawn today. The Georgian side set up a port protection brigade and this made it possible for the Black Sea men to return to places of their permanent deployment.

An ITAR-TASS correspondent was told on the telephone by Andrey Lazebnikov, head of the Black Sea Fleet press center that the ships are currently at the Adler roadstead in view of the weather conditions and that they will subsequently go to Sevastopol. All forces, including the commandant's office, have been withdrawn from Poti and the adjacent rayon.

Military Procurator Analyzes Defeat in Abkhazia

AU0112115093 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 19 Nov 93 p 2

[Interview with General of Justice Aleksandr Shushanashvili, Georgian chief military procurator, by unidentified SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA correspondent; place and date not given: "Everything Must Be Told About the Abkhaz Tragedy"]

[Excerpts] [SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **You personally witnessed the events in Abkhazia. What would you say were the main reasons for our defeat?**

[Shushanashvili] The main reason for the defeat in Abkhazia and all our misfortunes in general is that we Georgians are fighting Georgia in whatever way and with whatever we can; we are doing everything to prevent the formation of the Georgian state, the creation of a Georgian army, the establishment of the supremacy of the law, and the restoration of the country's economy. Unfortunately, we have already achieved certain results. Today, in Georgia, the rule of law has collapsed, the economy has been destroyed, national consciousness has been shattered, and the people and the authorities are being terrorized. If things continue in this way, either statehood in general will soon collapse and there will be total chaos or we will see the establishment of the dictatorship of the mafia and the most horrible regime of oppression and anarchy. Unfortunately, this process has already begun. Nowhere and never has the criminal world been so audacious with regard to the authorities.

As regards the specific reasons for our defeat in Abkhazia, many factors played a role here. In the first place, probably our naivete. The world saw that, to all intents and purposes, an organized Russian military force was fighting against us. However, we, for some reason, did not admit this and made Russia a mediator and judge, and began to determine relations with the Abkhazian bandits through international law and international organizations and turned an internal state problem into an international one. By underestimating the real opponent and his capabilities in this way, we were unable to create a military spirit within the country and acquire sympathy and support on an international scale. We should have known that the Abkhazian problem would not have been solved by means of innocuous UN resolutions and peace treaties concluded with the enemy.

Parallel to the war in Abkhazia, the danger of civil war was growing in the country, armed bands and groups were being formed, terrorist and subversive acts were becoming more frequent, and it was patently clear that a conspiracy to overthrow the state authorities was being planned. Instead of putting a halt to the wave of violence being perpetrated by these bands, the authorities wanted to bring them under state control and began negotiations with them and, I believe, drew up some kind of treaty. Everyone saw the deplorable consequences that followed the entry of these legalized bands into the war zone and so there is no need to add anything more to this.

The absence of a united army and military command, the incompetence of members of the Defense Council and military leaders, the absence of any strategic and tactical plans, the disregard for martial law and discipline, the failure to carry out orders, the unauthorized abandonment of military positions, desertion, panic, the supplying of false information to the commander in chief, and leaving the scattered army and devastated population to the mercy of fate seriously contributed to our defeat in Abkhazia. In short, we were faced with the signs of almost all the military crimes defined in law. The Chief Procurator's Office is carrying out an investigation to establish specific criminal acts and [the identity of] the criminals. If we are given the chance, everything will be done to establish the truth, everyone and everything will be exposed, and a correct legal evaluation will be made.

[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **High-ranking military leaders also probably had a hand in these crimes. However, they are at present all occupying their posts. Do you think that they are actively hindering an objective investigation?**

[Shushanashvili] [passage omitted] Your suspicions are not without foundation. An investigation into the events in Abkhazia is not to the liking of certain high-ranking military and nonmilitary individuals and they find it demeaning to come to the Procurator's Office and answer questions. We have contacted the head of state, who has issued a directive and instructed servicemen of all ranks to fulfill the legal demands of the Military Procurator's Office and, upon request, to appear before the military investigators and give evidence and present documents and materials connected with the case. The Cabinet of Ministers has been entrusted with discussing within one month the question of providing the Chief Procurator's Office with the material and technical resources and implementing effective measures to create normal working conditions for employees at the Procurator's Office.

Unfortunately, nothing has yet been done to implement this directive. Nor has there been any change in the behavior of those high-ranking officers and officials or in their attitude toward us. Naturally, it has not been for want of trying on our part. Everything has to be told about the tragedy in Abkhazia. This is not a question where something can be covered up and embellished and compromises and concessions made.

[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **We are hearing with increasing frequency that there was treason, and that Gagra and Abkhazia were sold out. Do you have any evidence of this?**

[Shushanashvili] The republic's Procurator's Office is investigating the crimes of the supporters of the ex-president. They will probably say what they establish and how they qualify these things. As for treason committed by military persons, this is also being checked. There is certain information, but it is not yet appropriate to make it public. Betrayal of one's country is a most serious crime and all the information has to be assiduously and thoroughly verified.

[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **The Military Procurator's Office will probably also be investigating acts of genocide against Georgians. You will be handing over materials on these to an international tribunal. Are you taking measures to establish who the criminals are and to arrest them?**

[Shushanashvili] Acts of genocide and other crimes committed by Ardzinba's [Abkhaz leader] circle are being investigated by the republic's Procurator's Office. Therefore, we are sending all the information obtained and received in this connection there. No international tribunal exists and I do not think that such a body will be created to discuss the genocide of Georgians in Abkhazia. It is clearly stated in the convention on genocide that the case concerning those accused of this crime is to be examined by a competent court of the state in which the crime occurred or by an international court whose jurisdiction has been approved by the signatories to the convention. The demand for the creation of an international tribunal to discuss the genocide of Georgians is yet another example of naivete on our part. That demand would have substance if we had said in time who, in fact, was fighting against us, who made us leave Gagra and Abkhazia, and who put us in that position then. Why are we bothering these international organizations? Why do we want Abkhazia to become a subject of international relations? Is it really so difficult to understand that international organizations, in essence, are not interfering and cannot interfere in the resolution of an internal state question as this would be a gross violation of the principles of international law.

[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **In that case, why is a government commission functioning and why is it preparing materials for an international tribunal?**

[Shushanashvili] I do not know why a government commission is functioning or what materials it is preparing. I know that proceedings are being initiated in connection with acts of genocide and an investigation is under way. However, only the Procurator's Office and the investigator have the right to investigate the crime. A government commission can neither question witnesses nor carry out any other investigatory actions. If an international court is created, it will investigate and establish everything itself. Where has one heard of a court passing sentence on the basis of material investigated and prepared by the injured and interested party?! [passage omitted]

[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **The Military Procurator's Office was created over a year ago. What have you done during this time to create a republican army and to establish at least basic order in the Armed Forces?**

[Shushanashvili] [passage omitted] It would probably take me a long time to enumerate what we have done. I will provide you with a few figures. This year, the

Military Procurator's Office has taken to court 124 criminal cases against 193 persons. Sixty-seven cases have already been examined and 82 persons have been convicted. We are currently dealing with 152 cases. Sixty-eight persons have been given prison sentences. It should not be difficult to imagine how we manage to arrest servicemen and bring legal action against them when they think nothing of destroying prisons, freeing prisoners, and disarming policemen.

As regards the creation of an army and the establishment of order in the Armed Forces, almost all the current normative acts in connection with this have been prepared and adopted on the basis of our proposals and with our participation. If these proposals and decisions had been implemented in practice, we would have a normal army today and there would also be order in the state. To avoid speaking in general terms, I will give you one or two facts. In May of this year, we submitted the proposal that commissions be created and efficiency reports be compiled on personnel in the Armed Forces, and the army be purged of drug addicts, criminals, and self-styled commanders. The proposal was approved, a decision was adopted, dates fixed, and people appointed to implement it. However, practically nothing has been done. We had earlier prepared a circular on rules for exposing crimes in subunits of the Armed Forces, initiating criminal proceedings, and preparing initial materials and handing them over to the Procurator's Office. To this day, they have not managed to make copies of this circular and send them to military units. Quite recently, we raised the question of disarming and withdrawing from the state of emergency zone in western Georgia all formations that were not part of the system of the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Security, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and abolishing those bodies and posts that were created in violation of the law. Not only have these proposals not been implemented, but no one has dared to repeat them out loud.

There is not a single country where the Procurator's Office has created an army; moreover, it will not be able to do so. It is only possible for the Military Procurator's Office to carry out its normal activities and to supervise the observance of the law in the armed forces in a country where there is a real army, where military rules and legislation are in force, and where professionals are in charge of and resolve military questions. As you know, we are blessed with none of these things. If some radical measures are not taken, we will remain in this state for a long time. No matter what ranks and awards we confer upon dilettantes and members of the mafia, they will be unable either to establish military discipline or win a war.

I am not mentioning this in order to justify myself. We are also not angels. We have plenty of shortcomings. But I am not going to indulge in self-criticism. We can indeed do more and this will soon be felt by both the army and its command. [passage omitted]

Parliament Imposes State of Emergency, Balks at Dissolution

MK3011131093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 30 Nov 93 p 3

[Yuriy Simonyan report under the "Georgia" rubric: "Eduard Shevardnadze Fell Out of Love With Parliament. Head of State Thinks Legislature Stands in His Way"]

[Text] Differences between Eduard Shevardnadze and the deputies had been discernible even before the legislature's recess. At the very first meeting after the parliament resumed its deliberations, the differences grew nearly unbearable. This time around, however, it was Eduard Shevardnadze himself who caused the split to deepen as he asked the parliament to extend the state of emergency for another two months. This was because after putting an end to "Zviadism," mafia clans had to be taken on, but following this the parliament will have to "go into recess" once again. Shevardnadze also spelled out—somewhat incoherently—his further plans for suspending the current parliament until a new Georgian constitution is adopted and early elections are called. Shevardnadze's plans, however, drew harsh criticism from the parliamentarians. This time, representatives of various parties, who had sounded skeptical about each other on numerous previous occasions, were unanimous. Against the backdrop of a lost war in Abkhazia, a lack of law and order, an economic collapse, a budget that has yet to be approved along with the lineup of the Council of Ministers, which was actually designed to draw up the budget, worrying signs of restricting freedom of speech and human rights, the speakers deemed the cessation of the parliament's activity to be inadmissible. The showdown culminated in an address by Shakiashvili, an independent deputy, who reminded the audience how Eduard Shevardnadze had become head of state. He reproached Shevardnadze for being unable to bring together a team of bright economists who would be able to rescue Georgia from disaster. Later, however, when the independent parliamentarian touched upon "private matters" and resorted to expressions not fit for a parliament, Shevardnadze left the hall. When he returned after the break, the head of state was fuming about the insults hurled at him but expressed his readiness to respect any decision the parliament might make. The parliament decided to extend the state of emergency, but would not allow the suspension of the legislature. Hence, upon imposing a state of emergency the parliament's activity was not suspended—just the opposite. Opposition deputies, whose numbers have grown considerably, are certain that Shevardnadze, drawing on support from his party—the Union of Georgia's Citizens—will not give up his attempts to dissolve the parliament. The head of state's loyalists insist on granting him all existing powers. In other words, they suggest that the idea of a dictatorship be translated into action, citing Chile's example, although they forget that any dictator needs a real force that could be used to bring order. Objectively speaking, this is something with which Shevardnadze is not quite comfortable. What he has is an army, which remains fairly uninhibited

in its sentiments, and "Mhedrioni" units, which do not report to anyone and do not recognize anyone except Dzhaba Ioseliani.

Meanwhile, in addition to problems known worldwide (Abkhazia, South Ossetia, refugees) a new one cropped up—the threat of a social explosion. Driven to despair by the authorities' inaction, Georgia's unemployed sent yet another letter to the head of state, this time around ultimatum-like in nature, which warns Eduard Shevardnadze in a fairly harsh tone of the consequences of actions they are ready to take if their demands are not satisfied. What the unemployed demand are free cafeterias, free mass transit fares, free municipal services. If the unemployed actually begin to act, they will definitely not be alone. A lack of heating, electricity, and bread will combine to ensure it.

Chikvaidze Views Ties With South Africa, CIS

AU3011203193 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 19 Nov 93 p 1

[Interview with Foreign Minister Aleksandr Chikvaidze by unidentified SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA correspondent; place and date not given: "Close Relations With Foreign Countries Are Vitally Important for Georgia"—first paragraph in SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA introduction]

[Excerpt] **Republic of Georgia Foreign Minister Aleksandr Chikvaidze returned a few days ago from the Republic of South Africa. This visit has attracted the attention of our society and given rise to many questions. Our correspondent asked Batoni [Georgian polite form of address] Aleksandr to answer these questions.**

[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **What points of contact can such a distant state have with Georgia, and vice versa? What reason lay behind your official invitation and from what angle were this distant country's interests toward Georgia revealed during your visit there?**

[Chikvaidze] As you know, the Republic of South Africa recently broke out of the partial but painful isolation that was imposed upon it by many countries in the world because of its policy of apartheid. On account of its level of development, advanced infrastructure, natural wealth, and, in general, strong economic potential, it will play a very prominent role in world political and economic processes in the near future.

South Africa's interest in Georgia springs from its desire to enter new spaces, the possibility of using Georgia's transport potential (ports, air route) and, in general, favorable location to establish ties with Russia and Central Asia, and, furthermore, our head of state's former constructive role in the resolution of problems connected with South Africa. In this country, as in the whole world (at any rate, in those states that I have visited), E. Shevardnadze's prestige is unshakable. This was confirmed in meetings with President Frederik de Klerk, Foreign Minister Roelof Botha, other ministers, heads of organizations, and leading and ordinary businessmen.

[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **In what sphere was cooperation given precedence during your visit and what meetings can you single out?**

[Chikvaidze] Taking into account our present situation, we naturally gave precedence to the economy. The composition of our delegation was correct from this point of view. It included Tengiz Geleishvili, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Ties, Temur Gogoladze, Georgian ambassador to Kazakhstan, and Vasil Jambazishvili, general director of the "Orbi" aviation company. However, a stimulus to cooperation in various spheres between our two countries should be given by the leadership of the host country and, therefore, the most important meeting was with President de Klerk who confirmed his country's desire for close relations with Georgia and gave the go-ahead to various organizations in that country to establish broad cooperation with us.

Of great importance was the meeting with my colleague R. Botha, with whom we prepared a comprehensive document on cooperation.

We held important meetings and consultations in the Small Business Development Corporation, the Expert House (with the leaders of the South African Foreign Trade Organization), the South African Development Bank, the Business Chamber that unites 45,000 enterprises, and with the minister of finances, trade, and industry and the minister of agriculture. It is impossible to enumerate all the meetings and questions raised and discussed at them. Several economic projects have been planned that our corresponding services will prepare and then complete together with our South African colleagues. These are: the extraction of liquid gas from coal, wine and brandy production, the application of Georgian experience and the joint elaboration of technological processes in the tea industry, and so forth.

[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **In addition to joint statements on cooperation, were any other treaties signed?**

[Chikvaidze] Batoni Vasil Jambazishvili signed an agreement on opening air communications between the two countries, which means that there will be regular South African passenger and cargo flights to Georgia and, by using our airports and air space, they will be able to link up with the CIS and various central Asian states by means of the shortest route. In addition to being financially profitable, this agreement will also contribute to the development of Georgia's air transport. R. Botha and I signed an agreement between the foreign ministries that envisages not only close cooperation between the two foreign political departments but also the training of cadres.

In addition, we agreed that, in order to study Georgia's economic potential and the prospects of individual branches, a large group of South African businessmen led

by the first deputy foreign minister would come here in the near future and they would familiarize themselves with the situation on the spot and determine their own sphere of interests, naturally, taking into account our interests.

[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA] **Batono Aleksandr, more than a month has gone by since we joined the CIS. Is this having an effect on our foreign political activities? Are any "obstacles" being perceived in relations with other countries?**

[Chikvaidze] I was expecting such a question. I have heard from many people that membership of the CIS will destroy our opportunity for free activity. I cannot agree at all with this view. Judge for yourself: Has any former [Soviet] republic lost a partner in the form of a foreign state because it has joined the CIS? Let us take our own example: I have been abroad twice since Georgia joined this alliance. First, to work on the UN Security Council resolution on Abkhazia. You probably remember this resolution that was adopted in October and that clearly and firmly supports everything that we are seeking to achieve. Our joining the CIS has not impeded the work of the Security Council but, on the contrary, has evoked a like-minded response from all its members, including Russia, the United States, France, and Great Britain, upon whom, you will agree, the adoption of any UN decision is greatly dependent.

As in the case of the other CIS members, nobody has threatened (or is threatening) Georgia not to do this.

We are living today in a different age. A narrow sphere of relations does not suit anyone. Integration is a 20th century concept and aim. It is in the vital interests of small states like Georgia to have the closest of relations with foreign countries, morever, with that group of states with which we have had a long history of relations and with which we cooperated as early as five years ago. A lot can be said on this subject. However, I personally have arrived at only one conclusion: Georgia's entry into the CIS is logical, takes into account reality, does not infringe upon the state's independence and sovereignty, corresponds to the interests of the people, the times, and current conditions, and will transfer relations with the former [Soviet] republics onto a new plane. However, it will require great labor and mutual understanding in order to regulate everything and overcome current opposition. Our joining the CIS does not alter our basic lines of foreign policy, namely friendly relations and cooperation with all neighboring states, without exception, and close ties with the West! This is the type of mutual cooperation that we would like to have with all the world's states and international structures. [passage omitted]

Latvia

Russia Accepts 3-Day Delay in Withdrawal Talks

WS0112113593 Tallinn BNS in English 1719 GMT 30 Nov 93

[Text] RIGA, Nov 30, BNS—Russia accepted a Latvian request to change the date for interstate talks from Dec. 3 to Dec. 6, said Aivars Vovers, the deputy head of the Latvian delegation.

Latvia needs the time to carefully study Russia's latest proposals for a withdrawal deadline, said Vovers.

The previous round of talks was suspended Nov. 17 because Latvia wanted to ponder the proposals.

Russia proposed to complete the withdrawals by September 1994 if Latvia allowed it keep its strategic radar station in Skrunda, Latvia, for six more years.

Earlier, Russia insisted that the earliest pullout deadline was the end of 1994 if it retained three "strategic points"—the Skrunda radar for 10 years, the Ventspils space reconnaissance station for six years and the Liepaja warport for five years.

Defense Minister Meets Czech Counterpart in Prague

LD3011115893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 2200 GMT 29 Nov 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Yakovlev]

[Text] Prague, 30 Nov (ITAR-TASS)—An agreement on cooperation between the Czech and the Latvian defense ministries was signed here by the two countries' defense ministers, Antonin Baudys and Valdis Pavlovskis. The latter is in Prague on an official visit.

Journalists were told at a news conference that the Czech side will supply Latvia with some types of military hardware and help it to train [military] specialists. The document also envisions the participation of officers from the two countries in military exercises and the exchange of experience in drafting security doctrines of the Czech Republic and Latvia.

During their talks the two sides pointed out the coincidence of views on NATO membership for the Czech Republic and Latvia. Speaking on this subject, V. Pavlovskis said: "Latvia is a small country with a small army. We are prepared to defend our independence and freedom, but on condition that we are integrated in European security structures. NATO's sphere of interests must be extended further to the east."

In connection with Russia's intention to obtain a CSCE mandate to settle conflicts in the territories of former Soviet republics, V. Pavlovskis noted that "relations with Russia have been unfavorable for Latvia, therefore we are skeptical about such intentions."

The schedule of the Latvian defense minister's visits includes tours of the Aero Vodochody aviation works, the military academy in Brno, the Zbrojovka gun factory in Uherske Hradiste, and a UN peace-keepers' training base in Cesky Krumlov.

Andrejevs Concludes Trade Pact in Australia

WS3011130193 Tallinn BNS in English 1422 GMT 29 Nov 93

[Text] RIGA, Nov 29, BNS—Latvian Foreign Minister Georgs Andrejevs and Australian Foreign Affairs and Trade Minister Gareth Evans signed an interstate agreement Nov. 23 on trade and economic cooperation.

Andrejevs started his Australian trip Nov. 21, but the first information about the visit reached his office in Latvia Nov. 29.

During the visit, Andrejevs met with Senate's President Kerry Sibraa, Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Minister Nick Bolkus and Australia's Governor-General William Hayden.

Lithuania

Parliament Approves Nuclear Convention, Other Accords

WS0112120793 Tallinn BNS in English 1719 GMT 30 Nov 93

[Text] VILNIUS, Nov 30, BNS—The Lithuanian parliament passed a resolution Tuesday on Lithuania's decision to join the May 21, 1963, Vienna convention on the civil responsibility for nuclear damage and the joint protocol on the application of the Vienna and Paris conventions.

The Lithuanian lawmakers also adopted a resolution on international agreements dealing with double taxation of income and capital, as well as fiscal violations.

Defense Minister Sees Security Guarantees in Union

WS0112101193 Vilnius RESPUBLIKA in Lithuanian 18 Nov 93 No. 223 p 4

[Interview with Defense Minister Linas Linkevicius by Violeta Gaizauskaite under the "Opinions" rubric; place and date not given: "The Minister Will Do His Best"]

[Text] [Gaizauskaite] **Lithuania has neither an officially approved military doctrine nor a national security concept. Moreover, it has no comprehensive law on national defense. What will serve as the basis for you as the national defense minister?**

[Linkevicius] I will do my best that this foundation is created as soon as possible. We are trying to make clear and resolve all issues associated with this problem.

[Gaizauskaite] **Politicians are discussing the guarantees for Lithuania's security. What is your view?**

[Linkevicius] We, as Estonia and Latvia, will seek membership in the European Community. This is an inseparable line of our security. From a strategic viewpoint, we orient ourselves toward NATO, because it is very expensive for one country to remain neutral. Everyone understands today that we will be unable to defend ourselves alone. Lithuania cannot remain all by itself, and it must join some union. Certainly, we must have our own efficient military structures.

[Gaizauskaite] **There is some talk about the organization of the national defense system, and a law on the state border, providing for the transfer of border defense to the Interior Ministry, is being drafted. On the other hand, in case of emergency, the law allows national defense forces to be used for ensuring domestic order. How would you assess such draft laws?**

[Linkevicius] If the government poses certain demands to the Army it must support them with finances and legal acts. If we are authorized to defend the state border, we must have the necessary amount of money for this. If we draft young people to the compulsory military service, we must create normal living and service conditions for them. Emotions alone will not protect the border....

[Gaizauskaite] **The 1994 state budget is being debated. Will there be enough finances to guarantee the functioning of national defense?**

[Linkevicius] Given the current requirements to the Army raised by the government and the Seimas [parliament], it is obvious that money allotted from the budget will be insufficient.

[Gaizauskaite] **However, the utilization of finances that were formerly earmarked for the National Defense Ministry and the Volunteer National Defense Service [SKAT] for their proper purpose is causing some doubt. Will you show a "firm hand" if you have to punish the offenders?**

[Linkevicius] First of all, there must be simple order in the Army. Servicemen must know the statute and be able to behave with arms. We also need proper facilities for storing arms. Speaking about the wrongdoers, they must be established and punished.

The SKAT is a more complicated problem. We must upgrade this structure, but we must not disband it. However, the tragic events [reference to former volunteer mutiny and victims shot by volunteers] force us to think and adopt tough decisions.

Security Adviser Dismissed Over High Crime Rate

WS0112161293 Tallinn BNS in English 1407 GMT 1 Dec 93

[Text] VILNIUS, Dec 01, BNS—President Algirdas Brazauskas dismissed his national security adviser, Alvydas Sadeckas, in the face of an increasing crime rate in Lithuania.

Brazauskas' chief aide, Raimundas Rajeckas, claims the discharge is a considerable loss. Rajeckas, who is also the chief of the president's staff, said Brazauskas did not consult him before making the decision.

Rajeckas said the adviser was not dismissed for political reasons, but the actual motivation of the step remains vague.

Egidijus Bickauskas, parliament vice chairman and head of the presidential group for struggle against organized crime and corruption, said he would like to "believe that the president weighed his decision well enough." Bickauskas noted, however, that "there will be a number of people who will rub their hands in joy."

Sadeckas himself declined to comment on the president's decision and only said that he felt responsible for the events and processes going on in Lithuania. He also asked reporters not to interpret his dismissal as sensational news.

Sadeckas held different positions at the Interior Ministry until last year, but was relieved of his duties on allegedly direct instructions of then Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius. The former presidential adviser has already reached retiring age.

Official Comments on Foreign Debt, Investments

WS0112112693 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 11 Nov 93 No. 219 p 6

[Article by Edmundas Juozenas, director of the Economy Ministry Investment Department under the "Specialist Commenting on Reader's Letter" rubric: "We Pay Old Debts and Promote Production"]

[Text] The concern about Lithuania's large foreign debt is understandable.

Why has this debt emerged? First of all, several years ago, prices for energy resources had increased considerably (several hundred times) before we had time to raise fees for electricity, gas, and heating in order to normally collect the money needed to pay for these resources. Since prices for energy have almost reached the world level now, a large part of the Lithuanian population is unable to pay for it. Enterprises have cut down their consumption, and most of them are heavily indebted to suppliers. Under these circumstances, the state has found itself in an awkward situation. Energy suppliers cannot pay Russia for gas and nuclear fuel. Russia threatens to cut gas supplies at any time. The effect of this is clear—chaos in Lithuania's economy is possible. The Lithuanian Government had no alternative and it used foreign credits for settlements with Russia. This is not a subsidy to energy suppliers. The energy industry will have to take this money back from debtors and repay the loan.

Another problem that I would like to debate with Mr. M. Bartninkas is the export of agrarian produce. Lithuania's former export of farm products accounted for more than

50 percent of the total production. We sold annually about 200,000 tonnes of meat and over 1 million tonnes of milk products to the former Soviet Union (primarily Moscow and Leningrad). After prices for energy resources had gone up, our articles became too expensive for Russia. Must Lithuania grow farm produce with state-supported export? Most probably, this does not pay. That is why the sale of meat to St. Petersburg for gas has become a problem.

The current state debt is $0.2 rather than $0.5 million, as Mr. Bartninkas indicates. It has accumulated from loans that were used to pay Russia for its gas and nuclear fuel, and the United States for its wheat and soya. Moreover, part of the loans granted by international financial organizations was used to stabilize our currency, and it is stored as Lithuanian Bank reserves.

This year, a small part of these credits, accounting for $9 million, has been used for state and private economic investments. Furthermore, the Lithuanian Government has provided guarantees for such credits. Their total sum is about $38 million, which also includes the state debt. It should be mentioned, however, that investment projects are carefully analyzed in the experts' commission for investment projects set up at the Economy Ministry. This commission submits proposals to the government loan commission.

Commercial banks operating in Lithuania are young and weak, and their credit reserves are limited. They are unable to extend long-term investment credits to economic units. Among all of their loans, long-term credits account for only 10 percent. It is more profitable for banks to grant short-term credits to various commercial structures for quite high interest. Therefore, the investment process has slowed down considerably in Lithuania. In comparison with 1989, this year's investments from different sources have dropped three-fold.

This means that the only way for speeding up this process is to attract foreign capital. However, there are many underwater stones here—when granting credits to Lithuania, international financial organizations often set such terms that prevent us from using them for investment projects.

The Lithuanian Government has submitted a proposal to the Seimas [parliament] concerning the establishment of a Lithuanian bank for development. This bank will extend long-term credits to small and medium-sized private enterprises. The bank's stock capital should be about ECU5 million.

A Lithuanian foreign investment agency is to be set up this year. Its goal will be to attract foreign businessmen and their capital, help them establish contacts with Lithuanian counterparts, and work as the entire civilized world does.

To prevent Lithuania from becoming a 'banana' republic, the government has defined priorities in its investment policy. These are energy, transport, communications and telecommunications, agriculture, farmers, food processing industry, services, and hotels. In addition, the government supports several programs—housing, flax industry, promotion of exports, and others. Several new national programs will be drafted this year.

Since the credit reserves for investment are limited, the government is trying to create conditions for those economic units which have investment projects to receive loans on considerably favorable terms coming from the G-24 states' fund through the World Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the IMF. International financial organizations are interested in our economic situation, and they watch that the debt does not become overly large. Thus far, this process has been controlled, and I do not think that Lithuania could become a 'banana' republic.